JANUARY 1973

MONTHLY REVIEW

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

VOLUME 24

8

Notes on the U.S. Situation

PAUL M. SWEEZY

Hospital Workers

J. AND B. EHRENREICH

Eleanor, Daughter of Marx

AARON ROSEBURY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS | VOLUME 24 NUMBER 8 JANUARY 1973

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: Notes on the U.S. Situation
by Paul M. Sweezy 1

HOSPITAL WORKERS: A CASE STUDY IN THE "NEW WORKING CLASS" by John and Barbara Ehrenreich 12

ELEANOR, DAUGHTER OF KARL MARX: PERSONAL REMINISCENCES by Aaron Rosebury 29

BOOKS: Orthodox and Marxist Economics in a Theory of Socialism by E. K. Hunt 50

CORRESPONDENCE: Israeli Subimperialism by Lawrence Lockwood 57

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly except July and August, when bimonthly, and copyright © 1973, by Monthly Review, Inc. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.

EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: 116 West 14th Street, New York, N. Y. 10011.
Telephone: (212) 691-2555.
Europe: Frances Kelly, 20 Garrick Street, London, W.C. 2.
Telephone: 01-240-3151; 01-240-2300.
MR Edizione Italiana: Bari 70124, viale Orazio Flacco 15.
Telephone: 241919, 246157.

Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

NEWSSTAND DISTRIBUTOR: B. De Boer, 118 High Street, Nutley, N. J.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One year—$7 in the U.S.; $8 foreign.
By 1st Class mail—U.S. $12; elsewhere $14
By air mail—No. America $14; So. America and Europe $18; Asia (incl. USSR), Africa, Australia $20.

EDITORS: Paul M. Sweezy Harry Magdoff Leo Huberman (1903-1968)

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: Bobbye Ortiz

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

We are glad to be able to inform MR readers of the forthcoming publication of a new Journal, *Critique*, described by its founders as "a new journal on Soviet studies and socialist theory." This is an outgrowth of work and planning by a group of faculty and students at the Institute of Soviet Studies at the University of Glasgow, Scotland. Two Conferences of Radical Scholars of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe have been held, the most recent in London in October, 1972, attended by some 400 persons from Britain, the Continent, and North America; and similar conferences will be held in the future. Basically, the Conferences and *Critique* aim to attract the interest and support of those "who disapprove of capitalism and take a critical approach to the USSR." MR readers will recognize this as an accurate description of MR's position, and will understand our enthusiasm for this new initiative. We will include further details as they become available. Meanwhile, inquiries

(*Continued on inside back cover*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES ON THE U.S. SITUATION AT THE END OF 1972

By Paul M. Sweezy

This article was written for a special issue of the well-known Latin-American weekly *Marcha,* published in Montevideo. My colleagues thought it would also be of interest to readers of MONTHLY REVIEW.—P.M.S.

As 1972 draws to a close, the U.S. scene is characterized by relative calm in both the economic and the political spheres. This appearance, however, is deceptive, for the calm does not reflect a condition of stability in any aspect of the country's national or international existence. In what follows I shall be concerned primarily with the underlying real situation rather than with outward appearances which are not only superficial but also subject to rapid and even drastic changes.

Politics

Nixon's re-election in 1972 is usually described as a landslide, implying (purposely or not) that the people of the country were expressing overwhelming approval of the man and his policies. This interpretation is seriously misleading. Nixon's victory was a landslide only in the sense that he won in all the states except Massachusetts and the District of Columbia and hence captured the overwhelming majority of the electoral

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

votes. In every other respect his victory was unimpressive. Of the total potentially eligible voting population (139 million) only 54 percent actually registered and voted. Nixon got approximately 60 percent of the vote cast, which comes to slightly less than a third (32.4 percent) of the potential electorate. There is nothing overwhelming about these figures. Furthermore, all the evidence from opinion polls and political reporting indicates that even among those who voted for him, Nixon is not a popular or respected personality. Most of those who voted for him did so because they felt that in one way or another it would be to their personal interest to have him continue as President.

McGovern's extremely poor showing reflects above all a pervasive cynicism about the whole U.S. political system, especially among the poor and the youth who normally provide more than their share of nonvoters. For a while during the primary campaigns it looked as though elements of these strata of the population might be moved out of their usual apathy by McGovern's populist rhetoric. But after his nomination, he retreated from most of his progressive positions in a vain search for Democratic Party unity. The activist young people were turned off, and what had been widely thought to be a huge youth vote for McGovern simply evaporated. Meanwhile, the big bourgeoisie, alarmed by the same rhetoric which for a time had appealed to some of the young people, closed ranks behind Nixon and poured tens of millions of dollars into his campaign coffers. An additional factor in McGovern's poor showing was his failure to capitalize on what should have been his strongest issue, the Vietnam war. McGovern offered no serious critique of the war, treating it simply as a mistake (for which, incidentally, his own political party had its full share of responsibility), and in other respects (especially with respect to Israel and the Middle East) sought to convince the country that he could protect U.S. imperialist interests better than his opponent. But Nixon had already undercut this stance of McGovern by his clever diplomacy vis-à-vis China and the Soviet Union, which won for him a totally undeserved reputation as a peacemaker. I shall return to the question of Vietnam below.

Before the 1972 elections, the Democratic Party controlled

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

both houses of Congress, and this situation was left essentially unchanged by the elections. In other words, the elections changed nothing, clarified nothing, settled nothing. All the problems, domestic and international, which have been plaguing the country in recent years are still there, and the political means of dealing with them, which have been woefully ineffective up to now, show absolutely no signs of improvement.

Economics

The U.S. economy is experiencing at one and the same time a cyclical boom and secular stagnation. Recovery from the recession of 1970-1971 (the fifth or sixth since the Second World War, depending on the method of measurement used) began about a year ago and has proceeded throughout 1972. As normally happens in cyclical upswings, the most striking features of the present boom have been sharp increases in private investment, industrial production, and corporate profits. Profits in the third quarter of 1972 (latest for which figures are available) reached an all-time high of $53.7 billion (annual rate, after taxes). This has been in part the result of Nixon's price-and-wage controls, dating from August 1971, which have restrained wage increases while permitting profits to expand freely in step with rising production—developments which quite naturally have endeared the Nixon administration to its big business supporters.

At the same time, however, unemployment has remained high at approximately 5.5 percent of the labor force. This is the official rate, which is widely recognized as a serious understatement of the true amount of unemployment. True unemployment is probably closer to 10 percent of the labor force, and among some strata of the population (blacks and other ethnic minorities, young people, and especially minority and female young people) it rises to 25 percent or more, thus duplicating the kind of situation which typically exists in the countries of the Third World. At the same time, some 15 to 20 percent of installed productive capacity is idle, and real wages of workers have risen very little, if at all, for at least the last five years.

Not surprisingly, the economic situation just described has

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

given rise to much frustration and unrest among workers who see their bosses prospering while they are barely able to make ends meet, and in many cases are forced to go more and more deeply into debt to cover expenses arising from sickness (the most rapidly rising component of the consumer price index) or other emergencies. Already many labor struggles have broken out (as I write, there are no fewer than 48 strikes in progress in New York City alone), and some observers foresee a period of unprecedentedly fierce class warfare on the economic front. It is noteworthy, however, that so far these struggles have shown few if any signs of spreading to the political arena. The U.S. working class, insofar as it shows any political interest at all, still continues to divide its support more or less equally between the two traditional bourgeois parties. As long as this remains true, there are not likely to be any radical changes in the U.S. political scene.

International

Internationally, the most urgent problem facing the United States is a continuing huge deficit in the country's balance of payments. Up until 1971, this deficit was entirely due to what can be accurately described as the costs of empire—government expenditures abroad for wars, military bases, subsidies to client states, etc. These costs (which averaged $5.2 billion in the years 1968-1971) used to be regularly offset to a great extent by a surplus in the balance of trade (i.e. an excess of exports over imports), so that the net outflow of dollars was not necessarily a seriously disturbing factor in the world monetary situation. In 1971, however, the balance of trade also turned negative—for the first time in the twentieth century—and the combined deficit of the government and private sectors reached the enormous figure of $9.6 billion. A deficit of this size naturally caused speculators and money managers to anticipate a decline in the value of the dollar (matched by an increase in the value of the currencies of the other developed capitalist countries), with the result that they transferred billions of dollars abroad, putting further and eventually unbearable pressure on the dollar, and leading to the collapse of the dollar/gold standard which had been in force since the Bretton Woods confer-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ence of 1944. The dollar then declined around 14 percent against the West German mark and 17 percent against the Japanese yen, rates which were adopted as new official parities in the so-called Smithsonian agreement of December 1971.

The Nixon administration hoped that a devaluation of this magnitude would be sufficient to turn the balance of trade around, perhaps raising exports to rough equality with imports in 1972 and then going on to generate an export surplus large enough to defray the costs of empire in the years ahead. In this way it was hoped that the dollar could once again attain the status of a strong currency and the hegemonic position of the United States in the imperialist world could be assured. So far these hopes have not been realized: in fact, quite the contrary. During the first three quarters of 1972 the trade deficit was running at an annual average of over $7 billion (compared to $6.2 billion in 1971), and earlier optimism about a forthcoming turnaround has largely disappeared. Commenting on the outlook, the International Economic Policy Association, which represents some of the country's biggest multinational corporations, recently concluded that "even if the trade balance reaches zero, or a nominal surplus in 1973, as expected by government spokesmen, a large trade surplus, even including government-financed exports, does not appear to be on the horizon for several years, if at all."

What this means is that unless the U.S. government decides on a drastic reduction in the level of its foreign military and economic commitments (what we have called the cost of empire), the outflow of dollars is practically certain to continue on a vast scale. The consequences could only be a renewed weakening of the dollar, the scrapping of the Smithsonian agreement (already breached by the floating of the pound sterling some months ago), and increasingly vigorous efforts by the Western Europeans and Japanese to stem the influx of unwanted dollars and prevent their currencies from again being revalued upward. All this would signal the breakup of the capitalist world into trading and monetary blocs and the onset of forms of economic warfare between and among them not seen since the Nazi and Japanese drives for world hegemony in the 1930s.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Vietnam War

The situation just described threatens to deprive the United States of the dominant position it has occupied in the capitalist world since the Second World War. At the same time, however, a reduction in the costs of empire by any large amount would also threaten that position, since it would diminish the U.S. capability to intervene in the affairs of dependent states, encouraging revolutionary and nationalist forces to seek genuine political independence and full control over their own productive resources and the surpluses which they yield, now largely drained away as dividends and royalties to multinational corporations and interest and amortization to banks and governmental lending institutions. Faced with this dilemma, the U.S. ruling class is maneuvering on several fronts to strengthen its position in the capitalist world.

First and most important, it is for the first time seriously trying to disengage from the Vietnam war. At the time of writing (first week of December) a cease-fire has not yet been signed, but it seems likely that this will happen in the near future. There are two main reasons why Washington, after nearly two decades of futile efforts to prop up a neocolonial regime in South Vietnam, is getting ready to change its course. (1) Vietnamization, Nixon's strategy for winning the war, has totally failed. The 1971 offensive of the liberation forces has largely destroyed the military potential of the Saigon regime and installed the Provisional Revolutionary Government in control of most of the countryside. A complete takeover has been prevented only by U.S. air and naval bombardment on a scale unprecedented in world history. It is now clear that the choices before the Nixon administration are either the indefinite continuation of this policy or U.S. withdrawal (followed by the more or less rapid collapse of the Thieu dictatorship). (2) Vietnam is the largest single factor in the balance-of-payments deficit, and stemming this drain is an absolute prerequisite for any serious attempt to solve the dollar problem analyzed above. Under these circumstances, the move to bring about a cease-fire as the first step to U.S. disengagement was a logical necessity for the ruling class.

This of course does not mean that the war is about to end

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or even that the United States may not plunge in again. It is extremely difficult for the most powerful bourgeoisie in the world to admit that it has suffered defeat at the hands of determined revolutionaries in an area which it considers vital to its imperial interests, nor can there be any doubt that this historic victory of the Vietnamese people will prove to be an extremely important stimulus to revolutionary movements in other parts of the world. The U.S. ruling class may not, even now, be ready to face the full consequences of its defeat. But if not, it will surely be obliged to face the consequences of continuing the war, which could be equally disastrous.

The Struggle Among the Imperialist Powers

Regardless of what happens in Vietnam, an intensified struggle among the imperialist powers, rooted in the monetary imbalance already described, is inevitable. This, it should be stressed, is not a question of whether the rival imperialist ruling classes *wish* to enter into or avoid such a struggle: they cannot help themselves.* The Europeans and Japanese cannot go on accepting inconvertible paper dollars indefinitely, and the U.S. imperialists cannot allow the dollar to weaken indefinitely. A "logical" solution would be for the Europeans and Japanese to curtail their exports and open up their markets to the inflow of U.S. goods: in this way the U.S. balance of trade could be turned around and the dollar once again placed on a sound basis. But such action would be contrary to the very nature of capitalism, i.e., it would require the capitalists of Europe and Japan, acting through their governments, to renounce profitable markets and investment opportunities in favor of their natural rivals, the capitalists of the United States. Since this obviously will not happen, each side will have no choice but to attempt to impose its will on the other. Such attempts will take forms for the most part familiar to us from the past history of imperialist rivalries: foreign exchange controls, re-

* As far as the U.S. multinational corporations are concerned, they most definitely do *not* want a fight. They want a world of free trade, convertible currencies, harmony and peace—with themselves on top. This was the purpose of the system the United States imposed at the end of the Second World War, which finally collapsed on August 15, 1971.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

striction on imports, subsidization of exports, etc. Measures like these are incompatible with the institutional framework which the United States has sought to impose on the capitalist world during the last quarter century, symbolized especially by the Bretton Woods monetary system and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. As these global institutions break down, others of a national and regional nature will emerge and will be utilized offensively and defensively in a struggle for advantages comparable to the imperialist rivalries which characterized the periods leading up to the First and Second World Wars. This is not to suggest that this time too the result must be another major imperialist war, but it would be foolish to deny that the possibility exists.

From the point of view of the U.S. working class, this analysis has ominous implications. As the struggle against foreign capitalists grows in intensity, the U.S. capitalists will try to throw more and more of the burden on their own workers, through holding down wages, automation, speed-up, cutting social benefits, etc. These measures will be promoted and justified as being in the national interest; increasingly, workers who strike or otherwise resist the capitalists' efforts to raise the rate of exploitation will be branded as unpatriotic and subjected to various forms of regimentation and repression. It is too soon to say whether or not experiences of this kind will have the effect of politicizing the U.S. proletariat. Probably much depends on whether the Left can find ways to communicate with workers and to penetrate the curtain of deception and lies by means of which the bourgeois media conceal from the masses the true nature and explanation of their exploitation and misery.

The U.S. Left

This brings us to the problem of the U.S. Left and its prospects in the period ahead. Unfortunately, there is little reason for optimism, at least in the short run. The "New Left," which grew rapidly in the second half of the 1960s, collapsed and practically disappeared in the last two years. There are many reasons for this, but probably the most important is that the movement was built on an illusion. It had its origins in the events of the late 1950s and early 1960s—the Cuban Revolu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, the black civil rights movement in the South, the Vietnam war—which, taken together, cast a bright light on the real racist and imperialist nature of U.S. capitalism. Many young people with no political experience and no theoretical understanding to guide them reacted to this revelation with great energy and moral fervor. They symbolically opted out of what they had come to regard as a rotten society by creating a counter-culture; and at the same time they attacked it, also symbolically, through such means as marches, demonstrations, and teach-ins. The illusion was that these forms of symbolic behavior would rapidly change the system and replace it with another, more democratic and more humane. The radical young people of the New Left saw themselves as but the vanguard of a great revolutionary upsurge which in some undefined way would usher in a new and brighter day for the United States and the world. The realities of class structure and class power were of course very different from what this vision implied, and the movement which it sustained was bound to be short-lived. When it became clear, along about the middle of Nixon's first administration, that the war was continuing, that the racial and urban crises were getting worse rather than better, and that the only response of the ruling class was repression and more repression, the New Left simply fell apart. A small sector, known as the Weathermen, escalated their symbolic acts to the level of bombings, and then disappeared into jails or underground. Some joined the old established sects—chief among them the Communist Party, the Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party, and the ex-Maoist Progressive Labor Party—or attempted to form new ones on a local level. But by far the largest number dropped out of political activity, attempting to escape into communes in a few cases but for the most part accepting the distasteful necessity to accommodate to the system, at least to the point of getting a job and earning a living. Some of the latter took part in the McGovern campaign before the Senator's nomination but lost whatever enthusiasm they may have had when McGovern, the candidate, made it clear that he was, after all, more a Democratic Party politician than a crusader for New Left causes.

The black liberation movement, which is much older than the New Left, has undergone a parallel but only partly similar

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

experience. It began with integrationist struggles in the late 1940s and 1950s. Highlights of this phase were the Montgomery bus boycott, the Supreme Court decision in the Brown case, the rise of Martin Luther King, sit-ins and freedom rides in the South, with a climax being reached in the Birmingham struggles of the spring of 1963. By this time, however, it had become clear that racism was inherent in U.S. society and could not be eliminated by legislation or court decisions. The focus then shifted to Black Nationalism, with the Black Muslims enjoying a brief period of pre-eminence. Malcolm X's break with the Muslims, his murder, and the great riots of Watts, Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant, Newark, Detroit, and many other cities around the country marked the development of a new phase, that of Black Power, which in terms of its concrete goals centered on greater black control in black communities, and looked forward in the long run to the building of a revolutionary alliance of men and women of all colors to overthrow a system based on exploitation and racism. The weakness of the Black Power movement was that the organizations and leadership which it engendered lacked the experience, the depth, and the support among the black proletarian masses to carry on the struggle and at the same time withstand the fierce repression unleashed against them by the U.S. ruling class. The special target of this repressive campaign was the Black Panther Party, which broke up as a national organization under the strain, after many of its leaders were assassinated, jailed, or forced to flee the country. At the present time, the radical black movement seems to be confined largely to local organizations and groups, of which there are certainly many in existence but about which not enough is known to support reliable generalizations.

Another component of the radical Left, the women's movement, has fared no better. Women's Liberation was never radical as a whole, and even the limited number of "extremists" have always been divided among groups with varying degrees of political interest or commitment. This is not to deny the reality of a significant feminist awakening in the United States, related in various direct and indirect ways to the political ferment of the 1960s. But its radical wing is too small and amorphous to constitute a significant political force.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As an organized movement on a national scale, then, the U.S. Left has declined, both because of its internal weaknesses and because of outside repression, until little remains except the old-line sectarian parties. In the absence of anything else, these have experienced some growth in the last couple of years, but there is no reason to believe that any of them is on the way to acquiring mass influence, let alone a mass following. The Left, in other words, is part of, rather than an exception to, the apparent calm which characterizes the U.S. scene on the eve of Nixon's second term in office.

It is, however, well to conclude on the same note we opened on. The calm is on the surface. Underneath, crisis-laden tendencies and contradictions not only continue to exist but to multiply and are sure to erupt into the open in the historically near future. Nor will this happen in a social environment unaffected by the stormy experiences of the last decade. The New Left is gone, and the black liberation movement is relatively quiescent; but the impulses which gave rise to them are still there, stronger than ever. The great majority of those who have dropped out of political activity—and their younger brothers and sisters who have not taken up political activity—have done so because they have lost hope, at least for the time being, of being able to accomplish anything, not because they have a more favorable view of capitalist and imperialist realities than they did a few years ago. In fact a recognition of these realities is more widespread today than it has ever been, and the inner dynamics of the system itself insure that it will become ever more widespread in the future. There is more serious study of how the system works and where it is going among young people today than there was at the height of the New Left movement. Is it too sanguine to hope that these various factors will coalesce in the not too distant future to produce a new new left movement with fewer illusions and more understanding, which can begin the long and arduous task of winning U.S. workers, blue-collar and white-collar alike, to a socialist perspective?

December 8, 1972

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HOSPITAL WORKERS: A CASE STUDY IN THE "NEW WORKING CLASS"

BY JOHN AND BARBARA EHRENREICH

The kind of work most people do has been changing rapidly in the United States and other capitalist countries. Only a few decades ago, most working people performed unskilled or semi-skilled industrial labor, and "the working class" was predominantly the traditional blue-collar proletariat. Today, service workers, white-collar workers, highly educated technical and professional workers—the so-called "new working class"—together make up a majority of the American work force. At the same time, the organization and content of white-collar and service work have also been changing, taking on patterns reminiscent of traditional industrial work.

What is the political significance of these shifts in the nature of work and the composition of the work force? Some radicals have argued that the new working class experiences work-place oppression in ways which are quite different from the "old" working class, and which are more likely to create radical consciousness. Others have argued that the new/old working-class distinction is artificial, and that both kinds of workers have qualitatively similar work-place experiences. Still others have been ready to write off large segments of the new working class as salaried members of the bourgeoisie. The debate, especially in this country, has usually done more to con-

John and Barbara Ehrenreich teach at Old Westbury, SUNY, and are Associates of the Health Policy Advisory Center. They are the co-authors, with Health-PAC, of *The American Health Empire.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fuse than to illuminate the issues. Part of the confusion stems from a failure to clear up just who the "new working class" are: Workers in the service sector? All white-collar workers? College-trained workers? In part, however, the debate has suffered from a severe scarcity of empirical evidence and empirically based analysis about the "new workers" and their experiences.

We have studied the experience of workers in one of the largest and most rapidly expanding of the "new" industries—the hospital industry. The hospital work force spans all the possible definitions of the new working class, from blue-collar service workers, to semi-skilled white-collar workers, to highly educated professional workers. We talked to dozens of workers in each of these categories, and found that they almost all express needs, and experience forms of oppression, which seem to have no exact counterpart in traditional industrial settings, and which cannot be resolved in the context of the existing (capitalist) health system. If they seldom express these needs in the form of collective action to change that system, it is because there are strong countervailing forces which tend to divide the work force and distort the workers' very *experience* of oppression.

I.

In the hospital workers' story, the hospitals themselves are not just a static institutional backdrop. Today, hospitals constitute one of the most rapidly growing and rapidly changing industries in the country; a few decades ago they could hardly have been described as an "industry" at all. From the hospital workers' standpoint, the most obvious changes are in sheer size (from an average of 132 employees per hospital in 1950 to 312 in 1969) and in the increased amount and complexity of equipment (from an average of $312,000 in non-plant assets per hospital in 1950 to $1,302,000 in 1969). Total hospital employment tripled during the same period, from 662,000 in 1950 to 1,824,000 in 1969.* And even these figures under-

* The figures in this paragraph are for short-term, non-federal hospitals and are taken from *Hospitals* (August 1, 1970). In this article we are primarily concerned with workers in such hospitals and not those in mental hospitals, nursing homes, and the like (though many of our observations are equally applicable there).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

estimate the qualitative significance of the change, since many rural hospitals are still relatively small and technologically backward. Advances in the organization of health care occur first and are more concentrated in the big cities. There, the old neighborhood hospital has been all but replaced by, or swallowed up in, giant medical complexes, each containing thousands of beds, employing thousands of workers, and controlling assets which may run into the hundreds of millions.

The consolidation of the hospital industry into larger and larger units has been accompanied by basic changes in the functioning of hospitals. Most American hospitals are legally "non-profit" but, encouraged by governmental and private "cost-plus" financing mechanisms and by outright government grants, many have become aggressively expansionist, rivalling the most profit-hungry corporation in their endless pursuit of growth in assets and revenues. With much justification, consumer groups have charged that many large urban medical centers are "not in business for people's health." Their real priorities center around research, medical education, plant expansion, academic prestige, and high managerial salaries; patient care comes in virtually as a by-product.*

Before the Second World War, and before the current hospital boom, the hospital work force was made up of doctors and trained nurses, plus a large group of unskilled, semi-differentiated workers. No segment of this work force could be considered in any sense analogous to industrial workers. The doctors and nurses were usually freelancers or students, with no permanent attachment to the hospital. The others were economically marginal people, often handicapped, illiterate, or aged, who were paid barely enough for individual subsistence. With turnover rates for hospital workers in the range of 70 to 80 percent per year, there was no body of American workers who could be said to comprise a stable *hospital* work force.

The explosive growth of the hospital industry in the last two decades has led to the formation of a hospital work force

* The changes in organization and priorities of the hospitals and their roots in the sources of hospital income are treated in detail in *The American Health Empire: A Report from the Health Policy Advisory Center,* prepared by Barbara and John Ehrenreich (New York: Random House, 1970). See especially chapters 1-5 and 8-10.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which is increasingly stable, highly differentiated, and in many other ways similar to the industrial work force. Semi-skilled and unskilled hospital workers are no longer transients, or objects of charity, but long-term hospital employees who expect a day's wage for a day's work, and are increasingly turning to unions to make sure they get it. Skilled hospital workers, such as technicians and nurses, are now also almost entirely full-time salaried employees. They too have been joining unions or pressing their professional associations into behavior that is increasingly union-like.

Skilled and unskilled hospital workers alike face working conditions which more and more resemble those in an industrial plant. There is an elaborate division of labor: One New York hospital lists 42 pay categories of service and maintenance workers (nurses' aides, porters, kitchen workers, etc.), 35 types of clerical workers (secretaries, ward clerks, medical-record librarians, etc.) and 38 varieties of technical and professional personnel (registered nurses, lab technicians, X-ray technicians, physical therapists, etc.). And even this understates the fragmentation, for a pay category such as "clinical lab technician" includes technicians specialized in hematology, cytology, urinalysis, etc. As in many industrial settings, workers in hospitals participate in an increasingly small part of the productive process and may tend to lose sight of the final "product."

But despite this apparent "industrialization" of hospital workers, the hospital worker is not just an industrial worker whose "product" happens to be medical care. Hospital work is *different* from industrial work and the hospital worker faces contradictions which have only limited analogies in manufacturing industries or even in other service industries. First, and most obvious, is the fact that the central product of hospital work is not some artifact of questionable value, but a service whose value is *self-evident*. And no amount of automation or specialization can completely obscure this fact. No matter how fragmented or menial their jobs, no matter how bad their working conditions, hospital workers commonly express a degree of commitment to service, to doing one's best, that would be beyond the wildest dreams of an industrial personnel manager. "You still have the patients. You do the best you can," a ward clerk told us. (Indeed, hospital managements have often suc-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cessfully exploited the workers' "service ethic" to avert strikes and unionization.)

But the hospital workers' service ethic does not guarantee a selfless devotion to the hospital as an institution. To the extent that the modern hospital is not a "mission of mercy," but an expansionist business enterprise, the service ethic is a potentially subversive force. A nurses' aide who is a local union official at New York's Bellevue Hospital summed it up: "Some of our people feel they're not so much in the patient-care area as catering to the comfort of administrators. . . . They [the administration] say they want patient care but they don't make it possible."

The second major peculiarity of hospital work lies in the organization of work. For technological and historical reasons hospital work features a high degree of functional interdependence between workers of extremely different rank within the hospital and extremely different social status outside it. For example, a surgical operation commonly requires the cooperative efforts of a team whose members range in rank from surgeon to aides. The surgeon has had eight or more years of post-college training; he may earn more than $50,000 a year; he may sit on one of the hospital's key management committees, on the almost all-powerful "medical board," or even on the board of directors.* The aide may have no high school education, earn less than $7,000, and lack even the authority to make a simple suggestion. But in the operation itself, they are both essential participants, as the aide can easily demonstrate by making a small but fatal mistake. There is thus a continual contradiction between the worker's sense of her or

* Hospital management is generally composed of three groups: the doctors, the trustees, and the lay administrators. The trustees play a small role in the day-to-day functioning of the hospital, and have declined in importance altogether in recent years. The lay administrators' importance has grown as hospitals increase in size and complexity, but their role in policy-making is relatively small. In our opinion, the doctors represent the key element in the management of the major "industrialized" hospitals. (Cf. Health-PAC *Bulletin* [April 1969], and a Health-PAC report, *Coney Island Hospital: A Case Study in the Politics of Health* [17 Murray Street, New York City, 1970.]) The lay administrators *are* important in hospital workers' daily experience, but their role does not change our analysis of the contradictions in hospital work.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his own importance in the productive process and her or his total lack of importance in the institution.

To put it another way, there is a very real contradiction between the doctor's actual functional importance and his inflated status within the hospital. (Here we are not speaking of the doctors-in-training, the interns and residents, whose position is much more ambiguous.) As the division of hospital labor increases and the doctor delegates more and more of his historic functions to members of the nursing and technical staff, he becomes at least as dependent on the skills of other workers as they are on his. "You could imagine a hospital with no doctors. Everything would get done just the same," a nurse in a municipal hospital told us. "But try to imagine a hospital with no nurses. It would be chaos. The patients would all die of neglect." Similarly, the technicians could argue that, without them, the doctor would be virtually unable to diagnose a single case. As his claims to unique functional indispensability are eroded by the division of labor, the doctor becomes, in the eyes of the other hospital workers, more and more clearly, just a *boss*.

The doctor's position has no parallel in industry. On the one hand, he is a top executive in the hospital "corporation." On the other hand, he is simply a highly skilled production worker, working side by side with nurses, aides, and technicians, and subject to their continual surveillance. They are the first, and usually the only, witnesses to his failures—unnecessary postoperative complications, prescriptions for the wrong dosages of drugs, faulty diagnoses, etc. And they are the harshest judges of his ethical standards: Does he discriminate against poor or nonwhite patients? Does he care more about whether he can publish the case than whether he can cure the patient? Insofar as he has become an integral part of hospital management, his individual shortcomings, however minor, serve to discredit the entire authority structure of the institution.

The difference between the doctor-manager and his coworkers is not just one of rank within the hospital, but of absolute social status. In fact, the hospitals' elaborate and militaristic system of rank identifications—uniforms, pins, titles, etc.—is hardly necessary. Everyone knows that in the hospital, white males are likely to be doctors, white women to be nurses

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or technicians, nonwhites to be aides, janitors, and so on. Doctors *are* 98 percent white, 93 percent male, and predominantly from upper and upper-middle-class families. Nurses and technicians *are* usually lower-middle-class and white; 98 percent of nurses, and about 70 percent of technicians, are women. Aides, cooks, maids, etc., are lower-class men and women—in the big cities of the north, they are usually black, Chicano, or Puerto Rican. (In New York City's municipal hospitals, 80-90 percent are nonwhite.)

This class, race, and sex stratification is due not so much to biased hiring practices, as to the fact that in the hospital virtually everyone remains at his or her entry-level job. Compared to other industries there is an almost complete lack of job mobility, even though there is often a great deal of functional interchangeability between the various types of workers. For example, practical nurses commonly possess the same skills as RNs (Registered Nurses) and are often assigned responsibilities theoretically and legally reserved for RNs (at no extra pay, of course). But the only way a practical nurse can gain the title, the status, and the pay of the RN is by attending school full-time for at least two years. So the practical nurse, like the aide below her and the RN above her, tends to remain where she started, i.e., at exactly the level toward which she was tracked long ago in public school.

The result is an occupational hierarchy which seems to have been almost designed to promote conflict. There is an unbridgeable gap—of both institutional rank and absolute social status—between the technical and managerial elite (doctors and administrators) and the great bulk of the work force. The structural inequity of this hierarchy is made inescapable by a productive process which mixes the two groups in intimate daily contact. Finally, there is a growing substantive antagonism between the two groups over the fundamental issue of the *purpose* of work: human service versus the hospital managers' corporate priorities.

II

To have meaningful work and to be adequately recognized for doing it, both materially and in terms of respect and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

status within the institution—these are the hospital workers' real and conscious needs. So what prevents the collective expression of these needs? What maintains the hospital hierarchy in the face of the contradictions we have described? There are two main stabilizing forces, operating in part on different sets of hospital workers. For the unskilled and semi-skilled workers, there are forces which lead to a kind of passive alienation from the content of their work. For the skilled workers, there is the ideology of professionalism. The first denies the service ethic and accepts the class division within the hospital. The second denies the class division and diverts the service ethic into a professional "ethic" of institutional loyalty.

Undoubtedly many of the lower-level workers enter hospital work because they can find no other semi-skilled jobs in the cities. But a large majority do start with the expectation that there is some special meaning and dignity to hospital work. Conditions (in even the "best" hospitals), however, are enough to undermine the efforts of even the most dedicated workers—understaffing, inadequate supplies and equipment, obstructive red tape, priorities given to non-patient care functions, etc. In their training or orientation, lower-level workers are warned against taking it all too seriously. "Do not try to achieve perfection in everything, because, admirable as it is, it is an invitation to failure and often is most impracticable," warns one text for practical nurses. (*Personal and Vocational Relationships in Practical Nursing,* by Carmen F. Ross, Philadelphia, 1969, p. 103) Suggestions and innovations from the ranks are not encouraged, and are usually viewed as "troublemaking." An aide told us, "You go to your supervisor [about a patient care problem]. She doesn't do anything. Eventually, *you* stop caring, too." Again and again we heard the refrain, "After a while you just don't give a damn." You become the adjusted, "industrialized" worker, for whom hospital work is just a job.

The recent wave of hospital unionization has done much to reinforce the psychological industrialization of the lower-rank hospital workers. Like unions in other industries, hospital workers' unions do not challenge the nature of the "product" or the organization of work. Their interest in qualitative, service issues has been largely a matter of public relations rhetoric, and their

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

efforts to reform the occupational hierarchy have been minimal. In effect, the unions' message to the workers is, "We can't do anything about the fact that you have a meaningless dead-end job, but we can get you paid more for doing it." In fact, the hospitals pass wage hikes for hospital workers onto consumers, either in the form of higher charges or reduced services. So by concentrating on economic demands, without in any way challenging the hospital hierarchy and its non-service priorities, the unions implicitly place the needs of the workers in conflict with the needs of the consumer—the ultimate alienation.*

Professionalism is a factor which is uniquely important in the hospital industry (though it is also present in a number of other "new working class" work settings) and deserves a much more careful examination. Some 40 percent of all non-managerial hospital workers are in job categories which consider themselves "professional." There is no question but that the hospital work force is relatively highly skilled: what is peculiar is that virtually every technically trained category in the hospital has pretensions of professionalism. A technician working for a drug company, for instance, would probably not consider herself a professional; in a hospital, she would. This is not simply a matter of individual self-appraisal, either. X-ray technicians, inhalation therapists, physical therapists, and a host of other job categories boast their own professional associations, complete with ethical codes, publications, conventions, dues, and so on.

Obviously, to make sense out of this rampant professionalism, it is necessary first to clear up what is meant by a "profession." The word calls to mind lengthy, specialized training, high standards of performance, ethics which transcend personal desires, and other worthy attributes. Doctors and lawyers come to mind. The importance of these images is not that they are accurate but that they reflect the special status accorded to professional workers in our society. They usually earn more and are almost always accorded more respect than other workers. But performing what would generally be called "professional" duties in a "professional" manner does not suffice to make a worker a "professional." For example, a practical nurse and a

* On the growth of hospital unions and their impact on hospital workers' struggles, see Health-PAC *Bulletin* (July-August 1970).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

registered nurse may perform exactly the same duties at an identical level of technical and ethical standards. But only the RN is a real professional, i.e., a licensed member of a legally recognized professional group.

Thus the word "professional" has two sets of meanings—one based in popular imagery and the other in legal reality. In the latter sense, a profession is an organized occupational group which has been granted a monopoly over the performance of certain functions and a certain degree of autonomy in carrying them out. For example, the medical profession has a legal monopoly over the prescribing of drugs, surgical practice, the classifying of people as fit or unfit for a variety of functions, etc. It has almost complete autonomy to police its members and to set standards for the admission of new members.

Once we have said that a profession is a legal entity, we have said that it is also a social and political entity. A group does not become a profession by winning a mass vote of confidence, but by winning the recognition of courts and legislatures. In the words of sociologist Eliot Freidson:

> A profession attains and maintains its position by virtue of the protection and patronage of some elite segment of society which has been persuaded that there is some special value in its work. Its position is thus secured by the political and economic influence of the elite which sponsors it—an influence that drives competing occupations out of some areas of work, that discourages others by virtue of the competitive advantages conferred on the chosen occupation, and that requires still others to be subordinated to the profession.*

The American medical profession provides one of the clearest examples. In the mid-nineteenth century there was no American medical profession, only a welter of competing sects. The emergence of one group of doctors as the modern medical profession was due less to their technical superiority (they had little at that time) than to the conscious intervention of the ruling class (and particularly of the Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations.** (Today, of course, the medical profession is a political

---

* *The Profession of Medicine* (New York: Dodd Mead & Company, 1970), p. 72.

** Cf. *Witches, Midwives and Nurses: A History of Women Healers*, by Barbara Ehrenreich and Deirdre English (Glass Mountain Pamphlets, P.O. Box 238, Oyster Bay, New York, 11771, 75¢).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

force in its own right, quite capable of defending its own interests without overt ruling-class intervention.)

To return to the numerous other health professions: Everyone recognizes that they have a much lower status than the medical profession. In fact, there is a definite hierarchy of health professions. At the top is the medical profession, the only completely autonomous health profession, the only one whose authority was derived directly from the ruling class. All the other health professions were sanctioned by, and are to varying degrees supervised by, the medical profession itself. (Sociologists recognize their dependent status by calling them "semi-professions," "paraprofessions," "allied health professions," etc.) The ideologies of these professions reflect their subordinate status and create, in the professional worker, an internalized "sense of one's place."

Consider first the nursing profession. RNs occupy an intermediate position in the hospital hierarchy—subordinate to the doctors, but in a supervisory role with respect to practical nurses, aides, and (depending on the hospital) several other kinds of semi-skilled workers. Ideologically, nursing professionalism combines the authoritarianism necessary for the nurse's supervisory role with the authoritarianism implicit in her relation to the doctors. In a way, this sense of mixed status could be said to come "naturally" to nurses: RNs are women, usually from the lower-middle class. Being women, they have been socialized to be subordinate to the male doctors. Being of high enough economic class to have afforded nursing education, they can easily feel superior to the aides and practical nurses.

This pattern goes back to the origins of the nursing profession in the late nineteenth century. Nursing as we know it was invented by a small number of upper-class reformers, under the intellectual leadership of Florence Nightingale. The Nightingale nurse was defined by her "character," rather than by her skills; and the nursing "character" was modeled after the upper-class Victorian lady: To the doctor, she brought the wifely virtue of absolute obedience; to the patient, she brought the selfless devotion of a mother; to the lower-level hospital employees she brought the firm but kindly discipline of a household manager, accustomed to handling servants. She desired none of the doctor's skills or prerogatives. His professionalism

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stemmed from the masculine realm of scientific thought, hers from a kind of innate feminine spirituality.

As far as hospital management is concerned, the historic professional self-image of the nurse is as serviceable today as it ever was. Nursing is still a "feminine" profession, and nurses are still trained to be "ladies" (i.e., to imitate the manners and style of upper-class women) and hence to feel a class above the workers they must supervise. Today, however, the four-year liberal arts degree is replacing "character" as the hallmark of class. If the nurses' professional organizations have their way, "professional" nursing, i.e., supervisory roles, will be restricted to the graduates of four-year, college-based, nursing programs. There is still no threat to the doctor, because baccalaureate nursing education is no richer in scientific content than the old hospital training. All it takes is a smattering of high-priced liberal arts courses to make sure that the nurse is a class above her subordinates.

The other sub-medical hospital workers' professions are narrower and more craft-oriented than the nursing and medical professions. Each comprises a narrow set of functions spun off by the medical profession in the last thirty years or so—medical technology, inhalation therapy, physical therapy, medical record keeping, radiation therapy, etc. Organizationally, these relatively new "allied" health professions lack even the dubious independence of the nursing profession. For example, accreditation of schools for training allied health workers is controlled by the AMA Council on Medical Education. Certification of individuals in most occupations is jointly supervised by the allied professional society and its parent medical-specialty society (for example, the American College of Radiologists in the case of X-ray technicians).

The creation of the allied health professions represents a kind of pact between highly unequal parties. The medical profession delegates one of its functions and agrees to recognize the new practitioners as fellow "professionals." (Presumably there is no physician's task so inconsequential as to be entrusted to nonprofessionals.) In practice this means that doctors and hospitals agree to give preference in hiring to certified members of the new occupational grouping, or at least to pay them more than uncertified persons who may have simply acquired the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

skill in question. Members of the new allied health profession, in turn, agree to "keep in their place": to submit to medical domination of accreditation and certification, to confine their work activities within limits set by physicians, and so forth.

The ideology of the allied health professions is amply illustrated by this credo of the medical technologist:

> As a medical technologist, I am proud, with a pride that is tinctured with a true humility, with a pride in being one of the trio in the medical profession, the physician, the nurse, and the medical technologist, each of whom functions in his distinct way. As a medical technologist, I am independent, with a cooperative spirit in working with my fellows in the medical profession. I do not want to encroach upon anyone else's premises.*

To the hospital, the new allied health professionals are simply workers who do not see themselves as workers. *Workers* are too quickly alienated by fragmented jobs; true *professionals* rejoice in the exercise of their craft. *Workers* identify with other workers in their institution, and can unite on the spot around common grievances. *Professionals* identify only with other members of their profession, and look to a distant professional society for long-term advancement. Finally, *workers* need discipline and close supervision; the true *professional* can be trusted to adhere to the ethics and standards of his profession in any situation. If he should abandon his ethics—by overreaching his narrow responsibilities, criticizing a superior, joining a strike, or whatever—he faces a punishment more severe than firing: he may be decertified by his own professional society, and tossed back into the ranks of mere workers.

III

Conditions of work in the modern industrialized hospital engender a uniquely clear set of class and caste antagonisms. The hospital joins, in the intimacy of its productive processes, members of the upper and upper-middle classes, whose institutional functions are increasingly managerial, with a large body of workers from less privileged strata of society—women, the poor and near-poor, and, in certain localities, nonwhites. It pits these two groups—the managerial elite and the rest of

* From the *American Journal of Medical Technologists,* reprinted in E. Freidson, *op. cit.,* p. 68.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the work force—against each other in conflicts, not all of which can be resolved without a radical recasting of the nature and purpose of hospital work. There is the classic industrial conflict over wages and working conditions, the improvement of which necessarily threatens management spending priorities. There is the worker's need for meaningful, service-oriented jobs, which necessarily threatens management-spending priorities. the hospital as a business enterprise; there is the worker's need for advancement in skills and for participation as a real "team" member—needs which run headlong into the doctors' defensive monopoly over the scientific underpinnings of the production process.

But, as we have seen, there are forces at work which serve both to obscure these needs and to prevent collective action around them. Lower-level workers are encouraged by management and by their unions to set aside qualitative demands in return for economic gains. Skilled workers are seduced by the ideology of professionalism into forgoing both qualitative and quantitative satisfactions in return for an abstract sense of status. The result is an increasing division of the non-managerial hospital work force into two groups with opposing class identifications: on the one hand, a proletarianized body of unskilled and semi-skilled workers, and, on the other hand, an equally large group of skilled workers who, through the device of professionalism, are allowed to participate—however vicariously—in the very real status of the doctors.

If the hospital were a socially isolated institution, one might expect a stable equilibrium to be achieved between the workers' dissatisfactions and the countervailing forces of alienation and professionalism. But hospitals are not ivory towers—all the less so, in fact, since they have expanding needs for public subsidy, for manpower, for real estate, and for "teaching material." And because the hospital's internal hierarchy so precisely mirrors the stratification of the larger society, it is vulnerable to the slightest egalitarian breezes from the outside. Third-World consciousness and, very recently, women's consciousness make the hospital hierarchy appear more palpably unjust everyday, and provide a basis for collective workers' action. Even more compelling has been the emergence of consumer groups, especially in poor areas, whose struggles for bet-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ter care have heightened the contradictions between the hospital's corporate interests and its public "mission" of service and have forced workers to take a stand. As a result, the hospital industry has witnessed a degree of insurgency unparalleled in other sectors. Only in hospitals in recent years have there been even partial plant seizures; only in hospitals have there been explicit demands for workers' control.

For example, in the summer of 1968 workers at Topeka State Hospital demanded pay increases, training programs for unskilled workers, and community control of the hospital. Instead of striking, they seized the administrator's office and briefly ran the services themselves. At New York's Lincoln Hospital, in April 1969, workers in the mental health facility demanded job upgrading and community-worker control. They ousted the administrators and head doctors and operated the services themselves for several weeks (with the cooperation of many of the "professional" workers). Again in the late summer of 1970, there was a major worker and community upheaval at Lincoln around demands for community and worker control of the entire hospital. The insurgent workers' organization, the Health Revolutionary Unity Movement, temporarily established community worker committees to monitor medical practice and won the ouster of some of the more conservative doctors. There have been dozens of other, less dramatic cases, where hospital workers have transcended the forces which divide them to agitate for worker and consumer control of their institutions.

Straws in the wind or prophetic breakthroughs? There's no way, by dint of sheer analysis, to know. The *contradictions* in hospital work which could lead to further unrest and the *countervailing forces* which seem to mitigate, distort, or deny these contradictions are experienced simultaneously by hospital workers. The hospital workers' very *experience* is contradictory; it leads *both* toward resistance and acceptance of their situation. We cannot put the contradictions on one side, the countervailing forces on the other, try to balance them, and come up with an abstract conclusion such as "hospital workers are potentially revolutionary" or "hospital workers are potentially allies of the bourgeoisie." Only the hospital workers themselves can solve the equation, and only through their *practice*. This

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

practice, in turn, is conditioned by their immediate experiences in the hospital, by the efforts of management to direct the workers' response to that experience, and by external forces which shape their psychological and material responses. Moreover, the answer may turn out to be different for different types of hospital worker.

A similar analysis could be made of other types of workers, both "old" working class and "new." In fact, the whole debate over the politics of the new working class seems to us to be in part a false one. The new working class, like the old, is not *either* potentially revolutionary *or* potentially bourgeoisified. It is *both*. The task for radical intellectuals is not to weigh abstractly which set of forces *is* or *ought to be* stronger, or which group of workers is theoretically the more revolutionary agent. Rather their function is to serve whatever incipient movement exists by helping to identify points of intervention and to expose management's conscious or unconscious counter-strategies. In the end, of course, the test of any analysis is not its internal logic, but whether it *works* in the sense of its illuminating and reinforcing ongoing struggles.*

* The research on which this paper is based was aided by a grant from the Louis M. Rabinowitz Foundation, to which we express our gratitude. A much more detailed treatment of hospital workers (along with a similar treatment of an "old" working-class group, steelworkers) is currently in preparation.

Profits are the barometer of the country and the higher the better. There is NO WAY profits can be too high.

—Allen P. Stults, President of the American Bankers Association

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JOURNAL of CONTEMPORARY ASIA

A quarterly journal seriously concerned with the nature and modes of social change in contemporary Asia. In its pages we have published articles on both the theory of social change and interpretations of Asian political, social and economic problems.

Recent articles, Vol. II, No. 4:

George Lee, *An Assimilating Imperialism*
Michael Morrow, *Thailand: America's New Frontier*
Richard Franke, *Limited Good and Cargo Cult in Indonesian Economic Development*
John Gittings, *Hong Kong's China Watchers*
Premen Addy, *South Asia in China's Foreign Policy*
Ho Chi Minh, *The Youth of Annam* (not available before)

Plus review articles, book reviews, documents from the liberation movements in South Vietnam, DRV, Bangla Desh, Korea, Philippines, etc.

Subscription rates per annum:

Individual—US $8.50; Institution / Library—US $11.00; Business Firms / Government Agencies—US $13.00; Citizens of the Third World (in residence)—US $6.00

JOURNAL OF CONTEMPORARY ASIA
P.O. BOX 49010, STOCKHOLM 49, SWEDEN

I would like to subscribe to

MONTHLY REVIEW

Special sub rates to students: $5 (foreign $6; £2·55)

☐ 1 year $7 (foreign $8; £3·40)
☐ 2 years $12 (foreign $14; £6)

Monthly Review Press
116 West 14th Street
New York, N. Y. 10011

Monthly Review Press
33/37 Moreland Street
London, E.C. 1, England

I enclose $..... I enclose £.....

Please send me MONTHLY REVIEW for ☐ two years ☐ one year

Name .....

Address .....

.....

(Canadian readers: if you pay in Canadian currency, please add 5 percent.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ELEANOR, DAUGHTER OF KARL MARX: PERSONAL REMINISCENCES

BY AARON ROSEBURY

The author of the following article, my father, was born in 1867. He was 24 when he first met Eleanor Marx and she was 36. As he makes clear, he was a Russian immigrant, only too conscious of a meager self-acquired education, whereas she was the gifted daughter of an already famous father. The principal bond between them seems to have been their common devotion to socialism; but Eleanor was warmly friendly toward my father, and his feelings toward her suggest idolatry, tinged with infatuation. He had come to England some ten years before, and seems to have remained a factory worker and union organizer. He married my mother about 1900, two years after the following account ends with Eleanor's death. He emigrated to New York in 1909, where we joined him the following year. In England he had begun to write articles on labor matters for the *Jewish Daily Chronicle*. In New York he worked as editor, writer, and translator for the Ladies Garment Workers Union and the Fur Workers Union, using mainly Yiddish and English, although he had become adept at several other languages as well. His jobs with both unions ended some time in the 1920s for reasons never made fully clear to us children, although we knew they were bitter times for him, and there seemed to be some connection with the labor upheavals in this country which followed the Russian Revolution. Thereafter, and until he died in 1934, he and my mother undertook a series of ventures to make a living, including running a neighborhood movie theater, a summer boarding house in upstate New York, and a lodging house near Gramercy Park. In 1924 he published a book in Yiddish, *A Short History of the British Labor Movement* (New York: Jewish Socialist Verband). The article that follows, written about 1927, has been in my possession since my father's death. When I turned it up not long ago and re-read it, I thought it might be of interest today: It speaks warmly of an early feminist; it shows that rifts on the Left are nothing new; and it raises by implication the interesting question, did William Archer take credit for translations of Ibsen actually made by Eleanor Marx?

—Theodor Rosebury

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I first met Eleanor Marx Aveling in 1891. Together with other Russian refugees, I had joined a new movement in the East End of London, an offshoot of one dominated by Bakunin and Kropotkin. As secretary of this group I wrote to her, and she responded with an expression of lively interest in our "new movement for clear-cut Social Democracy," and invited me to call on her. So I visited her apartment near the Temple, a neighborhood then inhabited by lawyers and writers. Some of my associates were jealous of the honor Eleanor had thus conferred on me, and threatened to supplant me as secretary at the end of my term. What with one thing and another, I approached so renowned a personality with some awe and misgiving, rehearsing a form of deferential address as I came near, picturing a forbiddingly elegant apartment with a maid-in-waiting. I adjusted my tie for the seventh time as I knocked on her door. Eleanor opened the door herself, smilingly called me by name, shook my hand warmly, and soon put me at ease. She must have noticed my surprise at finding the apartment small, rather dark, and poorly furnished, reflecting poverty rather than elegance. She motioned me to a faded armchair and said, "Don't stand on ceremony with me, comrade. Take off your coat and make yourself at home." Then she left me for a long minute and returned with a tray of tea things and seed cake, and asked me to join her in this customary English social amenity. "You see," she explained as she poured, "I follow the domestic custom of my parents." She added that she always entertained comrades in this fashion, provided only that she had the wherewithal—an allusion to the recurrent poverty under which the Avelings were struggling.

For more than an hour she listened to my account of the new organization and of its activities and future plans, and she gave hearty approval to our aims and methods. She accepted my invitation to speak to the group in our meeting rooms, even though with standing room they could hold no more than three hundred. "I like small audiences," she said. "You reach the hearts more surely." I asked her to speak in simple German, and to expect hecklers, and she accepted the challenge in high spirits.

When Eleanor arrived to address us that first time, I met

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

her outside and escorted her to the platform. She took appreciative note of the large photographs of Marx and Lassalle on the wall, as she moved through the packed hall amid loud applause. She dealt with the hecklers with wit and conviction, and the meeting was a great success. Our association gained many adherents as a result of her talks.

Eleanor urged me with evident sincerity not to be a stranger, and I took her at her word and visited her about once a month, always at about 11 o'clock in the morning, when I knew she would be relaxing after a morning's work. I looked forward to these meetings keenly. Edward was rarely at home, with the perennial excuse of theatrical business, although his infidelity was known by then to everybody. Eleanor tried to cover her pain by excusing Edward on one ground or another. Publicly she put a brave face on the whole sorry business, brushing aside snubs and disregarding ostracism. But she was obviously glad to have receptive company, somebody on whom she could exercise the breadth of her knowledge. As soon as I arrived she would bring tea, make an excuse for Edward's absence, listen to my report of the work of my organization, and slowly expand in warm and friendly conversation. Feeling very much the ignorant factory worker, I tended to be reserved and was glad to be a good listener.

When she came to know me better she once asked me, "Do you write sometimes? Your letters are pithy and to the point. You show the knack of it." And in response to my appreciative nod she began giving me some suggestions toward improving the clarity of my writing. At the time I hardly thought of writing for publication. Eleanor encouraged me. "All you need," she urged, "is clearness of expression; the rest comes by practice." She showed me how to avoid repetition, how crudities could be eliminated in revision, and emphasized the desirability of terse phrasing. Her teaching and encouragement led me to become labor correspondent of the *Jewish Chronicle* and years later opened up for me an official connection as secretary for three years of the British I.T.O. Federation, part of Israel Zangwill's Jewish Territorial Organization.

Eleanor was the youngest of Karl Marx's daughters and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his favorite. She was genial, ardent, and unconventional enough to live her own life. She lived with Dr. Edward B. Aveling for fifteen years. She was "Mrs. Aveling" to her friends, but he was always her "Edward," never "husband." She came to a tragic end.

She had many of the qualities of her parents. Her charming nature was like her mother's, who, as Jenny von Westphalen, traced her lineage partly to the British Dukes of Argyle. She resembled her father, the son of a prominent German Jewish lawyer, in her reasoning power and her linguistic ability. The marriage of Karl and Jenny was evidently a good one; despite many years of privation there is no record of family discord in their nearly forty years together.

But of privation there was plenty, especially during the years from 1850 to 1860 in London, when the family lived close to starvation and suffered sickness and death among the children. Jenny wrote to a friend that Karl "is almost overwhelmed here by the pettiest cares"; and Karl in his turn wrote to Friedrich Engels in 1851, "It will bring my wife down to the grave if it lasts much longer. . . . [She] has to endure the most dismal poverty from morning till night." Much of the time they lived on bread and potatoes; sometimes even this was lacking. Two children were born in their cramped rooms and three died. The famished babies pulled at their mother's nipples until they drew blood. Laura Lafargue, the elder daughter, wrote in a letter to Marx's first English biographer, John Spargo:

> My mother was a beautiful woman, very tall, with a fine, full figure. . . . I can remember how, when we were children, [Marx] used to walk up and down the room with her, his arm around her waist . . . singing the ecstatic lines from Goethe's May song:
>
> Und Freund! und Wonne
> Aus jeder Brust.
> O Erd! O Sonne!
> O Glück! O Lust!
> O Lieb! O Liebe!
> So Golden Schön,
> Wie morgenwolken
> Auf jenen Höhn!
>
> Friend! and sweetness
> In each breast.
> O Earth! O Sun!
> Joy and ecstasy!
> Love and beloved!
> So beautifully golden,
> Like the morning clouds
> There on high!
>
> (Translation by A. R.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When Eleanor was born, in 1855, she was so puny and poorly developed that the doctor did not expect her to survive. It is said that on his orders she was fed on milk alone for five years, and mainly on milk for another five. At all events she grew plump and healthy and became the darling of the family. At school she showed remarkable aptitude, especially in history and the arts. "At twenty-four," says Eduard Bernstein in *My Life in Exile,*

> Eleanor Marx was a blooming maiden . . . with the black eyes of her father . . . and unusually vivacious. . . . In her sensitive and emotional manner she took part in our discussion of party matters. . . . Eleanor dedicated herself to the socialist movement. But there was another influence which had taken hold upon her soul—that of the theater. Eleanor Marx was an inspired worshipper at the shrine of the dramatic muse.

She showed much talent for acting and evidently looked forward to a stage career, but her mother's death and her meeting with Dr. Aveling seem to have deflected her from such a course. Perhaps her yearning for the limelight conflicted with her wish to serve the socialist movement. Bernstein alludes to such a conflict. Her father does not seem to have been opposed, but neither did he express enthusiasm for her stage ambition. She settled for amateur theatricals, in which she participated, together with Aveling, "for the benefit of the movement."

In 1887, Eleanor, with Wilhelm Liebknecht and Aveling, visited America and addressed meetings in New York and elsewhere. The editor of the *Jewish Daily Forward,* Abraham Cahan, mentioned in the Yiddish edition of his *Leaves from My Life* that her thoughtful eloquence made a profound impression. She wore "a green velvet costume in the ancient Greek style, . . . had a ringing musical voice, full of fire, [and] polished English diction." Cahan was equally impressed with her when he met her again in London four years later. Although Eleanor was hardly a match for her father in erudition and dialectical skill, she seems to have been a better speaker than he was. But even the gifted daughter of a great father, in the radical company she kept, could not gain recognition in the face of the late Victorian conscience. She was

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not forgiven for her companionate marriage with a married man separated from his wife.

Before I met Eleanor I had heard her speak several times. I remember being one of five thousand who listened to her in Hyde Park, and I shared the general delight in her musical voice and the force of her logic. She never spoke from notes. Then thirty-five, she had a mass of glistening black hair, dark piercing eyes, and what Liebknecht called a "blood and milk" complexion. She was full-figured and attractively feminine in her graceful platform manner, tossing her head and waving her arms as she spoke—an orator, indeed a spellbinder. She was continually in demand by labor organizations and served them willingly, often paying her own carfare. Like her parents, she made friends easily among untutored horny-handed workers. Yet she was always modest: I don't remember her ever boasting or strutting as did some of the outstanding men of her group.

During much of this period the Avelings were apparently living beyond their means, contracting small debts and often feeling the pinch. Before Engels died in 1895 they made ends meet on an irregular income from literary work. Both Edward and Eleanor were able translators, and they published books and pamphlets separately and together. They collaborated especially in their earlier and happier years. Aveling translated several things from the Russian; he also translated Marx's *Capital* from the German original, aided by Samuel Moore, and in addition wrote popular socialistic and agnostic essays. After their American trip the Avelings issued *The Working-Class Movement in America* under both their names, and *An American Journey* under Aveling's alone. For several years, as well, Aveling edited the monthly magazine *Progress*, to which Eleanor contributed.

Eleanor independently translated most of Ibsen's plays from the Norwegian. These were subsequently edited by William Archer. She also translated, from the French, Flaubert's *Madame Bovary* and the *History of the Commune of 1871* by P. O. Lissagaray; her father's *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany;* and *Anarchism and Socialism* by George Plekhanov. In addition she edited some of her father's minor

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

works. Some of this labor repaid her only in stimulation. There was no money for such services in the labor movement, which could provide a salary for a full-time secretary here and there, while other administrative workers, as well as lecturers and writers, served as willing volunteers. Eleanor was one of the first to do so. Tom Mann, in his *Memoirs,* says this of Eleanor in connection with the dockers' strike of 1889:

> One of the volunteers who rendered valuable clerical service was Eleanor Marx Aveling, a most capable woman. Possessing a complete mastery of economics, she was able, alike in conversation and on a public platform, to hold her own with the best. Furthermore, she was ever ready to give close attention to detailed work.

Even in those days the movement was split into warring factions, which only occasionally came together for specific purposes. There were political actionists, conservative trade unionists, and red revolutionists. The more notable leaders were George Bernard Shaw and Sidney Webb of the Fabian Society, H. M. Hyndman of the militant socialists, the Reverend Stewart Headlam of the Christian Socialists, and the artist-poet William Morris of the anti-Parliamentarians. The old trade unions were rich and strong, and content with things as they were. The new unions of unskilled workers tended to be zealous and aggressive, bringing to the fore such notable men as James Keir Hardie, George Lansbury, and Will Thorne. Eleanor served this last group mainly; she and Aveling both held membership cards in the Gas Workers and General Laborers' Union, which admitted "brain workers" as well as manual workers.

Eleanor had devoted her life to the socialist movement, but her alliance with Aveling was frowned upon by the leaders, and she fell back on her fellowship with workers and local officials, who supported her staunchly. The more intellectual radicals of the day talked much of their scientific approach to life, but few of them had any patience with such advanced women as Eleanor. An example is H. M. Hyndman, with whom I once had occasion to plead in person that Eleanor and Aveling be included among an invited group.

Hyndman looked like a patriarch, with his strong physique, his untrimmed dark brown beard and flashing gray eyes. He

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had a ringing voice, almost metallic in quality, and was known and respected for forthright speech. But he was also feared and disliked for personal attacks on those who disagreed with him, a trait which may have limited his influence to a small part of the British labor movement. Our organization had invited leaders of all sections of the movement to celebrate the opening of our permanent club rooms. Eleanor and Dr. Aveling promptly accepted, but Hyndman failed to reply. I approached him at a delegates' meeting. Being young in the movement and innocent of the leaders' likes and dislikes, I blurted out the names of the Avelings. Hyndman frowned and said, "I won't speak on one platform with that fellow." I argued that Mrs. Aveling was indispensable to us. Several people stopped to listen, seeing in me, as a representative of the immigrant East End, a curiosity among British radicals.

"Eleanor Marx does good work," Hyndman admitted. "She would wear the mantle of her father among us if not for her second choice of the Irishman. If she had only stuck to the Frenchman, her first choice." The reference was to Lissagaray, who had paid court to Eleanor before she met Aveling. One of our hearers remarked that Eleanor had a man's brain and a woman's heart, and that her choice—even her blunder—was her inalienable right. This seemed to convince Hyndman, who responded quickly, "I'll be there. I hope Aveling and I will not come to blows." I did not know Aveling, of course, and the remark seemed strange to me. At all events Hyndman came to our celebration, made a stirring speech, and left immediately afterward.

Months later, after getting to know Aveling a little better, I came to understand why he could be so cordially disliked. During the spring after the celebration of our club rooms—I believe it was at a Sunday morning May Day conference with all sections of the movement present—I found Eleanor and Aveling together. As the three of us walked off, Eleanor remarked that I was a receptive pupil. Aveling assented, but quickly changing the subject, suggested that we have a drink together, and led the way to a pub. He ushered us in through the "Gentlemen's" door and then ordered the cheapest drink, ale, which I had not learned to enjoy. Although he was a good platform speaker his private conversation tended to be banal.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When he thought he could not be overheard he asked me gruffly to lend him half a sovereign—a goodly sum at the time. Eleanor was visibly distressed; but, before her eyes could warn me, I handed him the gold coin, remarking that it was part of my club funds. He promised to repay it in a week and added that if he didn't, "Tussy" would. I had not heard Eleanor's nickname before. Aveling grinned oddly as he pronounced it—somewhat maliciously, I thought; and Eleanor, flushed and trying to smile, explained that it was the name her parents had used for her. There ensued some strained banter between them, with a feeble effort to pass the thing off as humorous. Eleanor had evidently been hurt, but Aveling did not seem disconcerted.

I knew they were living from hand to mouth then, and that Eleanor was coming to be the main source of such funds as they had. She worked hard and took pleasure in doing so, and was not above letting others put their names to her work; but even so there was not enough money for their needs. Aveling was getting indolent as a provider but remained lavish as a spender. Eduard Bernstein writes, "He had a passion for having everything of the best . . . a shameless manner of borrowing to pay for his pleasures, borrowing the scanty cash of the poorest of his acquaintances. His was the gift of fascinating the ingenuous, women mostly, by his lyrical and esthetic affectation and flirtation in order to exploit them." Even worse things were said of him, from petty miserable wrongs to acts that might have sent him to prison. By the time Eleanor recognized these vices in Aveling, she was unable to pull back but held on, believing in her ability to reclaim him.

Having found the scene in the pub painful, but knowing that it must have been much more painful for Eleanor, I sent her a note a few days later begging her to forget it and assuring her, untruthfully, of course, that I could wait indefinitely for the money—"until you get rich." I added that I valued her society and the instruction she had given me far above money, and followed up the note by visiting her before the end of the week. She apologized to me for Edward:

"You see, already too many people know our circumstances. Edward had no business to bring *you* in. We are not in immediate need and our credit is good. I expect a good round sum of money by the first."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It seemed to me that she overdid her attempt to be reassuring, and I wondered how acute her need really was. I could not help saying:

"Look here, Mrs. Aveling! The ten shillings do not worry me, and circumstances are no discredit. I have a little pile in the post-office savings bank for a rainy day, and the club funds will not suffer. Please tell me if you are in need. When you get rich . . . I owe you a debt."

"No, you don't. It gives me pleasure to teach you." Eleanor's glance fell on my black suit and shiny necktie. Both must have seemed to her of surprisingly good quality for the poor immigrant I was; and sensing what was behind her look I explained: both suit and tie had been cast-offs, given to me, in fact, by a wealthy man in Birmingham when I worked there in a lamp factory, as a sort of reward for identifying correctly the book and chapter of the Bible of certain texts he gave me.

"They look new," said Eleanor, skeptically.

"They've been mine since 1888. I wear them only on great occasions."

"Five years! And today is a great occasion?"

It was my turn to be abashed, but Eleanor gave me an understanding smile. I was glad to get off the subject with the help of a book I had noticed on her table, Lawrence Gronlund's *The Cooperative Commonwealth.*

"This is one of the first books on socialism I read," I said haltingly, regaining my composure.

"Quite a good book. Nothing new to me, but worth reading. You are not so dull, then. Those Bible texts and the silk necktie are decidedly suspicious. I have a good mind to investigate. *Cherchez la femme.*"

"Sounds like French," I ventured, staring blankly.

"Yes, it means 'look for the woman.'" I must have blushed.

"How quickly you've guessed it, Mrs. Aveling!" I countered. "She was a well-to-do Irish woman with a poor digestion. . . . I wonder if I could learn French. It was so annoying to miss the meaning of Buckle's French footnotes in his *History of Civilization in England.*"

"So you don't want me to unravel the mystery. And you have read Buckle, have you?"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Yes, I spent two months on the first volume, read parts of it three times, and filled several notebooks with extracts."

"Then you merely pretend to be ignorant. Shall I give you a few lessons in elementary French?"

"I should appreciate it very much. Am I worthy of it?"

"Please don't talk nonsense. We'll begin on your next visit. Today you must escort me to the matinee. I consider you worthy of that, at all events."

"Gladly," I agreed eagerly. But my voice must have shown concern: I had very little money. She added quickly, "Don't be alarmed. Not much money to spend. I have the tickets. Edward is somewhere out of town with a troupe of players. Tiresome people." A faint sigh escaped from her.

I don't remember the theatre. It may have been the Drury Lane or the Gaiety; but we saw "A Trip to Chinatown." As we came out into the lobby, Eleanor pronounced it "a rattling good musical comedy." I thanked her.

"I ought to thank you for coming with me," she said. "I wouldn't have gone alone. And to stay in those cheerless rooms without company brings on the blues. I promised to speak tonight at the Playgoers Club, and you have certainly helped me into the mood for it. You must come there with me. Have you met Eduard Bernstein? I expect him there." Bernstein was then the official representative in England of the German Social Democratic Party.

It was becoming clear to me that Eleanor disliked my efforts to be grateful or complimentary, but I couldn't help thanking her again for providing what to me had been a great occasion, and telling her how highly I valued her friendship. She replied that people reproved her for wanting friendship, just as if it were a weakness, "as though insolence and vanity were virtues. Are not such things distorted in our age?" A woman, she seemed to say, was not permitted to reach out for the friendship of a man. I had no words to meet this expression of her loneliness. But, as always, she was able to bridge the awkward moment herself.

"We have a good two hours yet," she said, "and I don't feel like going back to my rooms. How about tea and a stroll by the river?"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It was a cool tranquil evening, misty on the horizon but clear and starry overhead. As we strolled along the Thames Embankment, Eleanor talked of her parents' home life. Sometimes she forgot herself and became emotional and eloquent. Here is the gist of what I remembered later and wrote down:

"My father worshipped in no church. That is something for successful men to do. They thank the Lord for their wealth and ability to exploit rent payers and laborers. My father was not a success in the bourgeois sense. He despised that kind of success. But who will ever say that he did not live the good life, or that he wronged anybody? In his last years he came to admit that he might have been mistaken in some of his predictions and assertions. Had he been able to finish his work, he would surely have made needed revisions in it. Illness made him irritable at times, but both father and mother had sterling characters. With them, love and sympathy for others came first. We often had men in working clothes at our table, and my mother was very cordial to them."

I told her that at our club one evening the assertion had been made and challenged that Karl Marx had said things against the Jewish people, and asked her if there was any truth in it. She said it had been right to challenge such a statement:

"He said nothing that truthful Jews would not admit to be true—things for which the Prophets were stoned and martyred. In our day Isaiah would be called an anti-Semite—by the rich. I think of myself as a Jewess, although I'm irreligious. It is not what you believe or profess but the way you act. Isn't it so?"

I agreed, and suggested that Judaism is more a matter of principles than of rites and ceremonies.

"Well said," she replied. "My parents stood for principles. What if my father was poor? His name will shine through the ages. What if his great work, *Capital,* earned him no money? He didn't write it for money."

I mentioned having heard that John Milton had received five pounds for *Paradise Lost,* with a little more later on.

"My father used to say that *Capital* would not bring in enough to pay for the cigars he smoked while writing it. But the world will continue to talk about it and argue about it until a better day dawns."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I said I thought it must have been wonderful to have been brought up under such inspiring conditions. She agreed that there had been great stimulation in her childhood, in spite of poverty. "My father loved poetry and the drama. My sisters and I memorized whole pages of Shakespeare and Burns." Karl Marx had enjoyed Fielding, the elder Dumas, Cervantes, Balzac. His favorites were Aeschylus, Dante and Goethe. He had a special talent for languages and read many European journals in the originals. At fifty he began to learn Russian, and was reading and enjoying Pushkin and Gogol in six months. "We had more than a thousand books in our library."

It seemed to me that she had wasted herself on Aveling. If this gifted woman had had a more congenial man . . . I must have sighed.

"What are you thinking about?"

"That great minds should have to suffer so much," I countered. "Didn't George Meredith have to live for a while on oatmeal and water?"

She suggested that some great men had nothing rich but their thoughts. "Yet my father was very happy at times. He especially loved children. After serious work he could relax and be playful and entertaining. He used to make friends with the schoolboys he met on his walks, and talk to them about their lessons. Children loved him. My sisters and I looked forward to the Sundays when all of us, including visitors who came to see us, would go picnicking on Hampstead Heath. We used to romp with him, call him 'Mohr' [Moor], and make him tell us fairy tales. He knew so many of them."

She paused for breath. "And our friend Friedrich Engels—what a dear old man! I must take you to him one evening."

We had by now come near the Playgoers Club, and Eleanor, all aglow with the pleasure of her own recollections, took my arm as we walked in. Eduard Bernstein was already there, and she introduced me to him.

Eleanor spoke on "Naturalism in Modern Drama." Her audience seemed enchanted, as much by the quality of her voice and the beauty of her language as by what she said. Bernstein left no doubt that he was one of her admirers. I heard a woman sitting in front of me whisper to her neighbor, "A poetess and an artiste." The discussion brought out some opposi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion to her advanced ideas, but one of those who opposed her in substance still complimented her on the beauty of her language.

A certain Professor Garside, who had come from America, was stirring up dissension in the ranks of unskilled labor, the very people among whom Eleanor had great influence. Armed with reports indicating that Garside had served cross-purposes in New York and had even been suspected of spying, I visited Eleanor late one morning to urge her to take action against him. But clearly I had intruded on the aftermath of a quarrel with Aveling. She looked as if she had been crying. I could say nothing, and was in fact ready to withdraw; but she made me stay and explained that Aveling had gone off with her last penny, leaving her without so much as tea and cake in the house. She asked me to take her out to a nearby restaurant for a midday meal: "Are you rich enough today?"

Fortunately I had enough, and was glad of a chance to repay her for entertaining me so many times. "Rich," I remember quipping. "Sufficient for the day is the silver thereof." Which made her smile and say, as she went to get ready, "You seem to have a Biblical text for every occasion."

Overcome with sympathy for her plight, I tried to press some silver coins on her by putting them in her glove in her absence, and we nearly came to a quarrel ourselves. I mumbled something about owing her for the French lessons and only made matters worse. But she accepted my apology gracefully and told me she had tickets for a play by Oscar Wilde and that we were to visit Friedrich Engels afterward.

She led me to a modest little restaurant in Lincoln's Inn Fields, a home-like place for clerks and salesmen, where we had a good simple meal for very little money. Garside had been forgotten, and even my attempt to mention that, since I had seen her last, I had read and enjoyed Wilde's article, *The Soul of Man under Socialism,* got no response from her until she had satisfied her hunger: she must have been famished. It was not until we had left the restaurant and were walking in quiet back streets, away from the noises of traffic, that she said:

"Now I'm in a mood to talk about Wilde. I think him physically repulsive. But how lofty his thoughts are! Like Wil-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

liam Morris, he is an individualist-anarchist. Most artists and writers are that, as he points out so well in his article. I don't really disagree with him. Wilde and Morris have in mind a stage of socialist society long after the transition period, all settled and in good working order. We social democrats are the spade workers, preparing the ground for that transition. Artists begin with a definite idea in their heads and shape their picture, play, or novel to that end, whether as a representation of nature or as a message. But life itself is complex and elusive. It's all very well to be dogmatic about the future, but I'm not even sure we are headed toward better things. As things are now, they are certainly wrong. That's the main thing to emphasize."

After the play we walked to the neighborhood of Fitzroy Square, where Engels lived, as Eleanor continued to talk in the same strain, winding up with a reference to her father. "His critics say he was dogmatic and fanatical. I should like to know what man with a great message is not. He was no more assertive and outspoken than Darwin or Spencer or Haeckel. But part of his subject was the martyrdom of man by man for greed and lust. He may have been mistaken in his previsions, but certainly not in his criticism."

It is well known that the life-long friendship between Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels was of a rare quality. From 1850 to 1869 Engels helped the Marx family from time to time with gifts of money out of his salary. In 1869, when Engels retired with a fortune from his father's business in Manchester, he paid Marx's debts of more than £200, and settled on his friend an annuity of £350 to enable him to go on with his work. After Marx's death, Engels centered his friendship on the two surviving daughters, Eleanor Aveling and Laura Lafargue.

Engels's house was a haven for foreign socialist visitors, and he had congenial company almost every evening. With British and French visitors he tended toward serious conversation, but German guests made him more relaxed and convivial. Eleanor and I were lucky that evening to find him with exclusively German company, and in high good humor.

"The old darling is at his best tonight," Eleanor whispered to me as she introduced me. "Don't get drunk." They made her

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

drink some wine and join in the singing, a popular ditty by William Morris with the line, "He that will not glasses clink/ Down among the dead men!/Down among the dead men/ Let him lie!"

Engels seemed to take great pleasure in the singing. He was hale and hearty, his round beard iron-gray, his features mobile, his eyes smiling and wise. After I had drunk two glasses of wine he got me to one side and we talked of serious things. I was more talkative than usual, but Eleanor overheard and assured me afterward that I had made sense.

Meanwhile the singing continued. One lively drinking song stayed in my memory, but I could not reconstruct it exactly until I saw the words later, quoted in Bernstein's *My Life in Exile*. Engels himself had translated it from an old English song of three jolly post-boys sitting in an inn called Dragon and emptying many a flagon. Part of it goes:

Wer guten Wein hat
Und doch sich nichtern halt,
Ist wie das dürre Laub
Das im Herbst zu Boden Fallt.

Refrain:

Komm Schankwirt, giess die Becher voll,
Bis zum uberlaufen.
Heute wollen wir fröhlich sein,
Heute wollen wir fröhlich sein,
Heute wollen wir fröhlich sein,
Und morgen Wasser saufen.

A change of occupation prevented me from seeing Eleanor as often as I had done, or from visiting with her at all. During eighteen months I met her only four times, at public gatherings. But in the spring of 1895 she wrote and asked me to see her, and I took a day off to do so.

She was in much better financial condition and expressed eagerness to help me. Was I following up my French? Was I keeping up with important articles in the magazines? Eleanor had heard that several of my club associates had gone to America; was I thinking of doing so as well? I had indeed been thinking about it; the struggle in England had been hard. The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

admission seemed to affect her strongly, but I could get no hint of the reason for her feeling. I knew that her life with Aveling had grown, if anything, worse. Scathing articles about his unethical behavior had appeared in the radical press, disguised but unmistakably pointing to him. He had been excluded from a branch of the budding Labor Party. At Engels's house, guests left abruptly when they saw him there.

It was then that I asked Eleanor to help me with details of her life so that I could complete a notebook I had been keeping about her. She agreed, with the condition that I keep it confidential during her lifetime. I was taken aback by the suggestion and the sigh that accompanied it; and although she laughed as if to reassure me, she admitted to being sometimes tired of life, especially when it seemed that the movement no longer needed her. My consternation at her pessimism elicited the retort that she was in fact being reasonable and dispassionate. "You see, my good friend, my conception of the purpose of life is different from other people's. The movement has been my life, and now only two alternatives remain for me. If I can't reconcile them soon. . . ."

She was referring, evidently, to the movement and Aveling, her need somehow to hold on to both. She felt she could not go on into a new life with either one without the other, and the public nature of her dilemma was aggravating it beyond endurance.

"If you must go," she went on, "so be it. I suppose you are puzzled by the attacks on Edward. Alas, they are based on fact. But I have been with him for twelve years. . . . All my friends are worried, but most of them are half-blind to the problem. You are one of the few who understand. One alternative is to leave Edward and live by myself. I can't do that; it would drive him to ruin and wouldn't really help me. I'm a strange mixture, my friend. My father used to say that I was more like a boy than a girl. It was Edward who really brought out the feminine in me. I was irresistibly drawn to him. He had been to University College and had been graduated with honors in philosophy and natural science. Our tastes were much the same. He knew more than I about Darwin and evolution. He was a popular agnostic lecturer. We agreed on socialism.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We both loved the theatre. Neither of us cared for money. My father liked him. We could work together effectively."

Eleanor led me to a big bookcase and showed me volumes and pamphlets bearing both their names.

"If I sacrificed something," she went on, "it was no more than my mother had done. I was brought up in an atmosphere of love and candor, and learned to scout conventions. When I met Edward I had a good position in a boarding school, where I was respected and esteemed. I had to choose between concealing my free connection with Edward and risking my position. I chose to be honest, notified the principal of my choice and was promptly discharged. If I had gone the other way and chosen to lead a double life, repudiating the tradition of my parents, every door in high places might have been open to me. But although these last few years have been unhappy, I have the good feeling that, like my parents, I've been true to my convictions and have not yielded to hypocrisy. I could not have known that Edward would fail me. Even so, to turn away from him now would be to succumb to despair. I still have hope for him. Let the heathen rave; my heart is in the right place."

I would have done anything to help Eleanor, and I think she knew it; but there was nothing anybody could do. Conventional people, at the very best, judged her as foolish; religious people condemned her as unholy. Many of those who had once idolized her now turned away from her. She seemed to follow my thought.

"You see, the intellectual aristocrats treated my father the same way. In his last years the movement ignored him, breaking off all personal connections. British radicals are still puritans at heart. But things are not the same in other countries. Before you think of going to America, wait for the great socialist labor congress that is being held in London next year. There will be delegates from all over the civilized world. I believe it will be an epoch-making event."

Eleanor had recovered her vivacity. "Come on, pull yourself together," she said. "Let's forget the sham and pretensions of the world! Let's have something to eat and go to the theater, and not for the last time!"

"When the verb 'to have' is displaced from the center of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consciousness," I remember reading somewhere, "life stops being commercial and becomes artistic." Eleanor Marx followed this rule until 1895, during the time she was living on tea and seed cake and burying her troubles in work. She could endure poverty. She could ignore the snubs of her associates and neighbors. But Edward's growing infidelity slowly wilted her valiant spirit. In 1895 she suddenly became wealthy. Engels died in August of that year, leaving legacies of £8000 each to her and her sister Laura. For a while the Avelings' prospects brightened. Edward became domesticated, and Eleanor renewed her hopes of reforming him. They took a large house in Sydenham, in southeast London, with lawns and trees. I had occasion to visit them there in connection with the forthcoming London congress of 1896, and it was gratifying to see them both happily working in preparation for the meeting, their knowledge of languages having made them invaluable to the international secretariat. Eleanor was then forty-one. She was smiling and seemed contented, and looked much younger.

Then, being a delegate to the congress, I saw both of them every day during the sessions at Queens Hall which began July 27, 1896. The congress was impressive. There were great debates, and even the disharmonies were imposing. Among the 800 delegates were such notables as August Bebel, Wilhelm Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg from Germany; Jaurès and Millerand from France; Vandervelde from Belgium; and James Ramsey MacDonald of England, then a young observer rather than an active participant. Eleanor was the official translator into English, and as I watched her on the platform she seemed to be in her element.

In honor of Liebknecht's seventieth birthday, Eleanor gave an outdoor "at home" at Sydenham. Hundreds of delegates were there, mainly the British and German ones. It was a brilliant late afternoon in August, with the sun lighting up the faces of the guests as it sank in the west. Oblong tables spread with refreshments were arranged in a semicircle on the broad lawn. The delegates strolled informally in groups of two and three. I have a vivid recollection of Liebknecht reclining in a garden chair and talking to a group around him of days thirty-five years before when he used to play with Marx's children, who had nicknamed him "Library." I remember, too, the tow-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ering broad-shouldered figure of Will Thorne, then a gas worker, later a Member of Parliament, regaling himself with ham sandwiches and beer. Another guest was Vera Zasulich, a Russian delegate, who was known to have shot at General Trepoff in 1878 in an attempt to avenge a young prisoner who had been flogged for refusing to bare his head to the general. Vera was smoking one cigarette after another and gesticulating vehemently as she talked.

This was Eleanor's last appearance at a notable international gathering. I remember her acting the hostess, moving from one group to another in high spirits. But Edward was not there. He had begun to relapse into his former habits, squandering Engels's legacy; and perhaps he had the grace to avoid spoiling the party.

Things got worse during 1897. When I saw Eleanor she was worried and moody again. Their friends had deserted them again, except for a few, such as George Lansbury, Will Thorne, and Eduard Bernstein; but the cream of socialist society held aloof. Toward the end of the year Aveling began to disappear for weeks at a time. Then, early in 1898, the legacy nearly exhausted, he sold what remained of it over Eleanor's head. His legal wife had died, and behind Eleanor's back he married a young actress. There was little she could do. Litigation would have entailed insufferable scandal and served no useful purpose. Yet she continued to make excuses for him. She wrote in a letter to a friend on February 5, 1898:

"There are people who lack a certain moral sense, just as others are deaf or short-sighted or in other ways afflicted. . . . One is as little justified in blaming them for the one sort of disorder as for the other."

And two days later:

"There is a French proverb, 'to understand is to forgive.' Much suffering has taught me understanding. . . . I do not need to forgive. I can only love. . . ."

It was this excessive altruism that Aveling had known so well how to exploit. On March 31, 1898, Eleanor accepted ultimate defeat and killed herself with poison. "How sad life has been all these years!" she wrote in a suicide note. At the coroner's inquest Aveling testified that Eleanor had been of a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

morose nature and had often talked of suicide. Her shocked friends could hardly be content with such a statement. But the conventional world was ready enough to accept it; she had been at odds with it all her life, and the world that could not understand her in life could as easily misinterpret her death.

Aveling himself may have been profoundly affected by Eleanor's suicide. Perhaps guilt tormented him; he died in the same year.

There were no rites at the funeral. Before the cremation, Eleanor's friends bowed their heads in silence. Will Thorne spoke, his powerful voice breaking in a tremulous sob. To this day I can see the tears trickling down his cheeks, expressive of the silent agony of grief that oppressed all of us.

The Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral thought it necessary to preach a sermon on Eleanor's death. He linked the tragedy to her free mode of living; yet between the lines of his thought there was a tribute to her life of devotion to high purpose—to her ideals of love and service.

It is felt that women should, in all propriety, acquire only such knowledge as may be classed under one or the other of two heads: (1) such knowledge as conduces immediately to a better performance of domestic service—the domestic sphere; (2) such accomplishments and dexterity, quasi-scholarly and quasi-artistic, as plainly come in under the head of a performance of vicarious leisure. Knowledge is felt to be unfeminine if it is knowledge which expresses the unfolding of the learner's own life, the acquisition of which proceeds on the learner's own cognitive interest, without prompting from the canons of property, and without reference back to a master whose comfort or good repute is to be enhanced by the employment or the exhibition of it.

—Thorstein Veblen, *Theory of the Leisure Class*

HAMPSHIRE COLLEGE seeks innovative teachers to join growing experimental and interdisciplinary science programs. Broad background, flexibility and a strong commitment to undergraduate education are essential. Applications from women and Third World candidates are particularly encouraged. Send your resume and a letter describing some of your ideas in education by January 15, to: Dr. John M. Foster, Acting Dean, School of Natural Science and Mathematics, Hampshire College, Amherst, Mass. 01002.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS

ORTHODOX AND MARXIST ECONOMICS IN A THEORY OF SOCIALISM

By E. K. Hunt

Radical Political Economy: Capitalism and Socialism from a Marxist-Humanist Perspective by Howard Sherman. New York: Basic Books, 1972. 431 pp.; $12.50.

This important new book presents a complete overview of the ideas of one of America's leading Marxist academic economists. As such, it should be of interest to radicals everywhere.

The book is divided into four parts. Part one contains a chapter on methodology and a chapter on precapitalist societies; part two is entitled "The Political Economy of Capitalism"; part three, "The Political Economy of Socialism"; and part four, "The Political Economy of Communism." There are also five appendices containing technical theoretical extensions of ideas discussed in a more literary style within the book.

Professor Sherman begins with a distinction between "dogmatic" and "nondogmatic" (or "progressive") Marxists. What distinguishes the latter, he asserts, is a greater concern with Marx's methodology and a lesser concern with Marx's specific, concrete conclusions. Throughout the book the distinction is pushed. A part of the appeal of the book is the author's frankness about the origins of his own involvement in the intellectual disputes between

* E. K. Hunt teaches economics at the University of California, Riverside. Professor Hunt, co-author with Professor Sherman of *Economics: An Introduction to Traditional and Radical Views* (New York: Harper and Row, 1972), writes that he hopes "this review will focus on differences between Sherman and me which deserve widespread discussion among radicals."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

purists and revisionists (or dogmatists and progressives in Sherman's book):

> My initial political outlook was shaped by the very favorable American attitude to the Soviet Union during the Second World War. Then, for more than ten years at the peak of the cold war (1946 to 1956) I was a radical student activist. Forced, I thought, to choose between Joe McCarthy and Joe Stalin, I chose to believe in the Stalinist brand of Marxism. With the denunciation of Stalin and the Polish and Hungarian revolutions, my theological faith was shaken, so I was ready to participate in the renaissance of Marxist thought that has taken place since that time. (p. vii)

Since that time Professor Sherman has published several books and numerous articles in academic economics journals. These books and articles reflect both his training at the University of California, Berkeley, in orthodox academic economic theory and the values of a radical social critic. One of the most fascinating aspects of *Radical Political Economy* is the attempt to fuse elements of both Marxist and orthodox economic analysis.

The first half of the book is devoted to an analysis of capitalism. Before beginning the task, Sherman attempts (chapter 4) to reconcile neoclassical and Marxist value theory. His comparison of the theories is interesting because he demonstrates that one can make the theories compatible only by reducing neoclassical theory to sterile formalisms. Unfortunately, he fails to point out the most decisive theoretical advantage of the labor theory of value over the neoclassical utility theory: the neoclassical theory of value has no consistent or adequate theory of capital and profits, as the recent esoteric debate in academic journals on the "reswitching of productive techniques" has clearly demonstrated. These categories are of central importance and quite consistently analyzed within the labor theory framework.

This oversight is partially rectified in chapter 5 ("Poverty and Exploitation") where the author clearly spells out the Marxist theory of exploitation and the failure of neoclassical economists to explain the nature and origin of profits. Obviously this chapter should be read as a completion of the chapter on value theories, and Sherman's overly generous concessions to the utility theory will then be seen as more apparent than real.

Most of the remainder of the first half of the book is a description of the functioning and, more generally, malfunctioning of American capitalism. The titles of the chapters will serve to indicate their contents: Growth, Waste, and Pollution — Cyclical Unemployment — Monopoly Capitalism — The Capitalist State

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Democracy — Imperialism — Racism, Sexism, and Alienation. Taken together these chapters constitute an extraordinarily valuable description and critique of American capitalism. Professor Sherman's material is well researched, well organized and, perhaps most important, very well written. His clarity, simplicity of style, and frankness are pleasantly combined with verve, wit, and humor; and the product is one of the most readable radical texts in many years. Most radicals will find reading the first half of the book a highly rewarding and pleasurable experience.

The second half of the book—on socialism and communism—is no less readable. This section of the book, however, will undoubtedly spark much wider and more intense controversy among radicals.

An apparently wide difference exists, for example, concerning the appropriate radical response to the old right-wing charge, long argued by neoclassical economists, that central planning can never achieve an "optimal allocation of resources" and a "rational structure of prices," the words "optimal" and "rational" being defined by the conservative neoclassical theory of "Paretian optimality." (I have already published my view that this theory rests on assumptions that inevitably render it a conservative justification of the status quo.*) In responding to the neoclassical charge Sherman writes:

> It has long been known that economic calculation of optimal allocation of resources does not require "prices" in an actual market. We need only three kinds of information. First, we must know what resources are available, including men and machines as well as raw materials. Second, we must know the preference scale of "consumers," whether these are individuals or planners or politicians or some weighted sum of these. Third, we must know the "production function" of each output at the present level of technology.
>
> In both a private enterprise economy and in socialism, the third kind of information (about alternative production possibilities) is furnished by engineers, although the final choice among the technologies is an economic problem depending on the costs of various inputs. In a competitive private enterprise economy, however, market prices *automatically* reflect the first and second types of information, that is, the relative scarcity of different resources as well as the relative preference of consumers for different products

* E. K. Hunt, "Orthodox Economic Theory and Capitalist Ideology," MONTHLY REVIEW (February 1968), pp. 50-55.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(though these rational prices do not exist under monopoly capitalism). (p. 223, italics in original)

It should be noted that Sherman explicitly refers to the fact that under socialism the preferences or values that guide production may be those of consumers, planners, or politicians. This of course takes much of the conservative edge off the neoclassical criterion because, unlike the latter, it does not assume that the existing patterns of expenditures, and hence the existing income distribution, is ideal and just. Nevertheless, I believe that it concedes too much to neoclassical theory. There are two reasons why the concessions are excessive.

First, the assertion that a competitive private enterprise economy will *automatically* result in rational prices and an optimal allocation of resources plays directly into the hands of bourgeois ideologists. Sherman's caveat that we do not have competitive capitalism but rather monopoly capitalism is insufficient. Conservative ideologists never argue that the textbook model of perfect competition is an accurate reflection of economic reality. Rather, they argue that competition is an ideal that is only "reasonably closely simulated" in reality. Thus, any monopolistic distortion of the competitive model is treated as a minor modification of the theory which is comparable in significance to the distortion in the law of gravity created by the existence of air resistance on a falling body. The theory is only claimed to be a reasonably close approximation of reality. The following quotation from Milton Friedman is typical of the economic ideologists' point of view:

Of course, competition is an ideal type, like a Euclidean line or point. No one has ever seen a Euclidean line—which has zero width and depth—yet we all find it useful to regard many a Euclidean volume—such as a surveyor's string—as a Euclidean line. Similarly, there is no such thing as "pure" competition. Every producer has some effect, however tiny, on the price of the product he produces. The important issue for understanding and for policy is whether this effect is significant or can properly be neglected, as the surveyor can neglect the thickness of what he calls a "line." The answer must, of course, depend on the problem. But as I have studied economic activities in the United States, I have become increasingly impressed with how wide is the range of problems and industries for which it is appropriate to treat the economy as if it were competitive.*

* Milton Friedman, *Capitalism and Freedom* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962), p. 120.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The critical weakness of the neoclassical ideology is not that it fails to recognize the significance of monopolistic elements in the American economy (which is certainly true), but rather that it makes the desires and preferences of each individual, isolated, egoistic, alienated, manipulated "economic man" of the capitalist system (weighed, of course, by his position in the overall income distribution) the basis of all social values. Suppose pure competition did exist. The systematic exploitation, alienation, and general human degradation perpetuated in a competitive, anarchistic market system would hardly lead to anything "rational" or "optimal."

The second concession to the neoclassical ideology implicit in Sherman's statement is that it conveys the view (although it was undoubtedly not the author's intention) that a very important problem, *and perhaps the most important economic problem,* of a socialist regime is the marginal rearranging of productive factors, or the marginal changing of prices and costs so as to achieve a static condition of efficiency (in which a very small shift of resources from one line of production to another could not augment the social value of the resultant economic output). Certainly in a full-fledged socialist or communist society static efficiency could not be ignored. Nevertheless, viewing the economic problem of an emerging socialist society as one of static efficiency is likely to lead to very different practical results than obtain when one assumes that the most important problem is creating new social institutions and ideologies which will replace competition with cooperation, egoism with social motivation, and, in short, capitalist man with socialist man. In the short run, these latter objectives are very often likely to stand in direct conflict with the requirements of static economic efficiency. This is because the notion of static economic efficiency takes as given the most fundamental social, political, and economic institutions and is concerned exclusively with small marginal adjustments of inputs, outputs, prices, and costs, whereas creating a socialist society and socialist men demands far-reaching, fundamental institutional changes. During such transitions it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to specify what would even be meant by static economic efficiency. Attempting to achieve such efficiency seems to this reviewer to involve acceptance and perpetuation of existing (capitalist) values and institutions.

The difference in approach between Sherman and this reviewer can be illustrated by looking at chapter 23, "The Economics of Communism," which begins the concluding section of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

book. The chapter begins with statements with which most socialists would agree: "Socialists have always assumed a great increase in production under socialism as a prerequisite to communism. . . . It must be emphasized that the *economics of communism is the economics of affluence*." (pp. 340-341, italics in original) The main issue at stake is the nature and objectives of the socialist system that forms the transitional stage between capitalism and communism. On this issue, Sherman argues that

> a communist economy may be established without asking workers and managers to act as if their psychological attitudes had progressed far beyond the actual "human nature" imposed by the current economic base. To hope that revolutionary propaganda and education alone can permanently (beyond a temporary enthusiasm following a successful revolution) provide a sufficient basis for a change in human nature is not Marxist but utopian socialist. In other words, neither workers nor managers will change their competitive, egoistic, economic behavior *until* the material and institutional conditions are changed. A socialist economy in which payment for consumer necessities is required, reinforces and produces a competitiveness in people every day—it is not a leftover of capitalism. . . . Only when all consumer necessities have been free for some time under full communism would any social scientist, Marxist or otherwise, expect that acquisitive behavior might begin to diminish very considerably. (p. 343, italics in original)

This seems to be a rather strong assertion that a socialist stage somewhat similar to that which generally developed in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe is necessary for the development of the productive potential that forms the basis for the achievement of communism.

This immediately raises the issue of Chinese economic development and the Maoist philosophy of development, which has been succinctly and articulately summarized by John Gurley. The Maoist position is that if socialism develops on the basis of capitalist-type motivations then it will require another revolution to achieve communism. It is argued that

> the realization of the universal man is not automatically achieved by altering the forces of production, by the socialist revolution. Rather it can be achieved only after the most intense and unrelenting ideological efforts to raise the consciousness of the masses through the creative study and creative use of Mao's thought. Old ideas, customs, and habits hang on long after the material base

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the economy has been radically changed, and it takes one mighty effort after another to wipe out this bourgeois superstructure and replace it with the proletarian world outlook. This transformation of the "subjective world" will then have a tremendous impact on the "objective world."*

One of the most interesting and most fundamental issues at stake in this debate is the extent to which the study of orthodox economics tends to lead one to Sherman's position. As I stated at the beginning of this review, Sherman's book is a masterful and subtle integration of Marxian ideas and orthodox economic theories. At what points these two intellectual traditions are complementary or contradictory is an issue involving many difficulties and subtle ambiguities. Gurley writes that "many young economists are breaking away from the stultifying atmosphere of present-day 'neoclassical' economics," which, he believes, tends to foster an acceptance of "the rather narrow, materialistic goals of a capitalist society." Once this rejection is complete, Gurley argues, "China is bound to be attractive to many of these new economists."**

I do not believe that Sherman would reject Gurley's statement completely, however. A good deal of part two of Sherman's book is devoted to pointing out the unrealistic and ideological nature of neoclassical economics. Nevertheless, he recognizes that orthodox economics has fashioned many analytical tools with which a Marxist's economic understanding can be greatly increased. The significant task is to separate the scientific elements of orthodox economics from the ideological chaff. Sherman's *Radical Political Economy* is a sensitive, scholarly, clearly written attempt to do this, and to incorporate the best from the orthodox tradition into a general Marxian framework. As such, this reviewer hopes that the book is widely read. Differences of opinion on the issues I have outlined, as well as many others, will undoubtedly help to clarify the question of what Marxist economists can learn from bourgeois economics. Moreover, the book contains an exceptionally well written description and indictment of American capitalism—and a vision of communism—which most radicals will keenly appreciate.

---

* John G. Gurley, "Capitalist and Maoist Economic Development," MONTHLY REVIEW (February 1971), p. 22.

** *Ibid.*, p. 30.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

ISRAELI SUBIMPERIALISM?

The expanding economic, political, and military power of such nations as Brazil and South Africa in their respective regions has become a vital topic of discussion in the Left. The "subimperialist" phenomenon has been discussed not only in Ruy Mauro Marini's "Brazilian Subimperialism" (MR, February 1972), but in the editors' "Imperialism in the Seventies" (MR, March 1972). While the masses in the "subimperialist" countries remain cruelly exploited by local and foreign capital, the ruling classes have experienced a new prosperity, derived both from continued exploitation at home and from boosts in foreign trade. The "subimperialist" bourgeoisies have also become addicted to political and military interventions outside their own borders, as shown by Brazil's role in the 1971 Bolivian coup or Iran's maneuvers to establish a "sphere of influence" in the Arabian Gulf.

At first glance, Israel may seem to have little in common with Brazil, Iran, or South Africa, which possess larger populations and much richer natural resources. Nevertheless, within the Zionist movement the "subimperial" idea has existed from the beginning (Theodore Herzl, in the 1890s, habitually spoke of a Jewish state in Palestine as a potential "rampart of Europe against Asia"), and there is plenty of evidence that it has increasingly been realized in practice in recent years. In what follows I would like to call attention to some of this evidence, especially as it relates to Israel's rapidly expanding role as a producer and exporter of arms.

On March 29, 1972, the *Jerusalem Post* proudly announced that the members of NATO were considering purchase

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of two new Israeli products—the "Gabriel" and the "Arava." The "Gabriel' is an anti-shipping missile, believed to be the only one of its kind in the so-called Free World, while the "Arava" is a highly sophisticated anti-guerrilla plane. The "Gabriel" has already been purchased by Singapore for mounting on gunboats and is being considered by Iran, according to earlier reports. During the first quarter of 1972, foreign clients, mainly in Africa, have received 30 "Aravas" at $450,000 apiece.

While Israel's imports of such items as the American-made Phantom jets have been widely publicized, its role as an exporter of weaponry is less well known. The steady flow of foreign arms into Israel ($716 million in 1971) is accompanied by a smaller outflow of Israeli-made arms. According to recent estimates of the Israeli Defense Ministry, this outflow will amount to at least $80 million in 1972. By 1975 it is expected to reach $150 million. Israel's dual role as a purchaser and producer of weapons was recently explained by officials of the U.S. State Department, when they announced plans to assist Israel in perfecting certain weapons:

> To the extent that Israel could build tanks and planes and other advanced weapons, they point out that there would be less occasion for outcry in the Arab world over shipment of United States arms to Israel. And a more advanced arms industry would put Israel in a better position through sales to other nations, to finance more of her own defense needs. (*New York Times,* January 14, 1972)

Although Israel will continue to depend heavily upon imports of foreign arms, the notion of "self-sufficiency" has gained unprecedented importance. Whereas domestic arms production in 1966/67 was only $100 million, it rose to $370 million in 1970/71 and is expected to reach $740 million in 1975/76. The geometric expansion of Israel's weapons industry is reflected by the fact that today 10 percent of the entire Israeli labor force is engaged in military production.

The rhetoric of "self-sufficiency," however, conceals the meaning of the postwar rise in Israeli weapons production. Since 1967, Israel has been receiving an average of $1.1 billion a year in foreign capital—in the form of private investment, loans, and direct gifts, such as United Jewish Appeal donations from the United States. In contrast, the average yearly input before 1967 was only $340 million. In recent years, private investment and loans have increased sharply, while direct gifts have remained relatively stable. In 1972 the government expects $120 million in private investment

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from abroad, $915 million in loans, and $760 million in gifts—providing a total which is more than twice as high as the expected imports of military items, such as the Phantom jets.

With its own arms imports offset by foreign gifts or loans, Israel's "self-sufficiency" drive may at first seem difficult to explain. One of the basic factors behind expanding weapons production is private investment, particularly by American companies. Their goal is to develop Israeli subsidiaries that can supply both the domestic arms market and foreign markets. This ambition was very bluntly stated by an American businessman who was opening an Israeli branch for the manufacture of aircraft instrument panels:

> We have a number of objectives here in Israel. The first is to begin supplying the local air force with domestically produced instruments. Our second goal is to establish a scientific engineering organization that will attract Israel's brightest engineers and the third aim is to turn Israel into our base of international operations for the supply of our expanding export business. The latter now encompasses some 20 countries. (Interview with N. M. Zelazo, president of Astronautics Corporation of America, *Israel Export and Trade Journal,* December 1971)

The list of newly-developed Israeli weapons is by no means confined to the "Gabriel" missile or the "Arava" anti-guerrilla plane. Another highly sophisticated item is RAGE (Radiation Amplification for Gamma Emissions), a gamma-ray weapon perfected by the engineer Dr. Etan Harlew. RAGE, which "primarily is a commando weapon to be carried into the heart of enemy territory by small highly trained units" (*New York Times,* January 7, 1972) has already received an American patent and is being evaluated by the U.S. Defense Department.

At the same time, Israel Aircraft Industries is designing three prototypes of a large jet fighter/bomber, the Super-Mirage. One type of Super-Mirage, which has already undergone test flights, will be powered by the same JA-79 engine that is used in the American Phantom. (*New York Times,* September 14, 1972) Although it is probable that the new planes will be added to the Israeli Air Force's large supply of fighter/bombers, the possibility of exports should not be ruled out.

Israel is also winning clients for an extensive array of military communications equipment. In June 1971, at the yearly exhibition sponsored by the United States Armed Forces Communications and Electronics Association in Washington, the only for-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eign exhibitor was the Israeli firm Tadiran, which designs and manufactures highly specialized radio communications systems for military use. Tadiran, which is actually a joint venture between General Telephone and Electronics (Sylvania) and the Israeli firm Koor (owned by the Histadrut, Israel's state-supported "trade union"), now relies upon exports for more than a third of its yearly sales, its military products being sold to 20 countries. Dr. Abraham Harel, the head of its research and development division, has given the following description of what his firm is up to:

> Using the experience it has gained in manufacturing and marketing numerous types of modern military equipment under license from leading American companies, and meeting tough U.S. military specifications, Tadiran has embarked upon its own development program. (*Israel Economist,* August 1971)

The type of subcontracting that Harel describes also exists in the conventional weapons sphere. With American financial assistance, Israel will begin to produce the Storm rifle, an automatic weapon "said to be better than either the American M-16 or the Soviet AK-47." (*New York Times,* September 14, 1971) Since it fires the same .256-caliber bullet as the American M-16, there is little reason to doubt that the Storm rifle will find overseas buyers.

For many years, Israel's most popular piece of ordnance has been the Uzi submachine gun, described by some weapons experts as the "Rolls Royce of submachine guns." Ta'as, the firm that produces the Uzi, as well as cannons, mortars, hand grenades, and other ordnance items, reported in 1970 that its greatest problem was the gap between production and demand:

> Produced to the rigid quality and reliability requirements of the local defense forces and to NATO specifications, Israeli-made ordnance has by now developed a world-wide reputation for excellence and has established clients in 50 countries. Indeed, overseas demand for Ta'as products exceeds the quantities available, and there is a backlog of orders booked for two years. (*Israel Export and Trade Journal,* September 1970) Ta'as also reported that, since 1967, its exports of the Uzi had quintupled.

The expansion of arms production has been matched by rapid growth of technical/military services. Today, Israel possesses its own facilities for repairing the Phantom's JA-79 engine; and, with American assistance, manufacturing facilities are now being developed. (*New York Times,* January 14, 1972) In this way,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Israel may become a "service center" for the air forces of nearby countries such as Iran, Turkey, and Greece, which now rely on Phantoms purchased from the United States.

Such a possibility is suggested by the fact that Israel Aircraft Industries, under a contract from Boeing, now operates a "Total Modification and Service Center" that does $13-million a year in foreign repair work. (*Israel Export and Trade Journal,* October/November 1971) Similarly, Israel Aircraft Industries has created a subsidiary in partnership with the American firm Chromalloy for the repair of aircraft engines. Turbochrome, the subsidiary, will devote half its work to non-Israeli planes. (*Israel Economist,* July 1971)

At the beginning of 1972, agreements were signed that would allow Israel to manufacture spare parts for aircraft imported from the United States. In this way Israel is expected to earn an additional $100 million during the next three years. (*Israel Economist,* February/March 1972)

Israeli technical expertise is already being used outside Israel by such American firms as Motorola, whose subsidiary, Motorola Israel, is a supplier of communications equipment to the Israeli armed forces. In mid-1971, engineers from Motorola Israel completed a project involving installation of a centralized communications system for all airports in the Congo (Kinshasa). At the same time, Motorola Israel is a major exporter of electronic equipment, especially to Third World nations, such as Iran, Ethiopia, and Ghana, with foreign sales reaching $6 million in 1972. (*Israel Economist,* September, 1971)

General Telephone and Electronics (Sylvania) has also integrated Israeli experts into its world-wide operations:

> A number of Israeli specialists were trained at the Bartlett, Alaska, earth station completed by GTE last year. . . . This sort of expertise will be offered to other nations on a turnkey project basis by the Israeli subsidiary. The local firm's area of operations includes parts of Africa, Cyprus, Greece, Turkey, and Iran. (*Israel Export and Trade Journal,* March 1971)

Alumni of the Alaska earth station project have recently worked on a microwave communications system in Ethiopia and new earth stations in Nigeria and Venezuela. Although the earth stations are often described as elements of a non-military satellite tracking program, it should be noted that GTE is heavily involved in the United States Air Force TAC-SATCOM program,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which is aimed at developing a global advanced communications system relying upon tactical satellites.

Since 1967, Israel's ability to offer technical services to the American military-industrial apparatus has been enhanced not only by the flow of gifts, loans, and investments, but by a flow of personnel. It is estimated that 3,000 American technicians and scientists have emigated to Israel in the past five years. This form of input from the United States establishes a foundation for even closer collaboration:

> With personnel also come contacts and projects for cooperation and joint ventures—both research and manufacturing—that show promise of making the future scientific and technological ties between Israel and the United States as significant as the present military and diplomatic ones. . . . Cutbacks in science-based industries in America and ensuing fears of being laid off or losing research grants have undoubtedly prodded many people to emigrate. . . . Top technicians and department heads at Israeli electronic concerns are likely to be American immigrants. (*New York Times,* February 28, 1972)

In this way, Israel's weapons sector becomes both *materially* and *personally* capable of expanding its foreign sales, whether to the United States and NATO powers or to governments in the Third World. The pool of military/technical talent can produce not only items according to present weapons demands, but it can perfect new products that will generate new demands. At the same time, the skilled American immigrants can maintain connections with their base of departure, thereby attracting additional American capital to the Israeli arms industry.

Israel's rapidly expanding weapons sector, which accounted for 10 percent of Israeli exports in 1971, has been encouraged not only by foreign investors, but by all layers of the Zionist establishment. Since natural resources, such as oil, are not readily available, industrial production, with heavy reliance upon exports, is seen as the key to the future:

> [T]he industrial output of Israel can be expected to treble during the next decade, reaching a total of some $8.6 billion annually. Industrial exports will also treble to $1.8 billion annually. (Professor Michael Sela, Vice President of the Weizmann Institute, article in *Israel Export and Trade Journal,* March 1971)

Traditionally, industry has played a secondary role in the Israeli economy, and trade deficits have been a basic feature. In

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1967, imports per capita had averaged $270 per year, a figure higher than average per capita incomes in most Middle Eastern nations. Many analysts have interpreted the steady flows of foreign gifts and loans as subsidies that allow Israel to "live beyond its means"—in return for its services as a military spearhead aimed at the Arab world.

Nevertheless, the new emphasis upon industrialization and, in particular, upon expansion of technologically oriented industries suggests that Israel is being groomed for the role of a subimperialist power. On the one hand, increased exports to Third World nations, which are already foreshadowed by a 1971 export surplus of $52 million with Asia and Africa, will be sought by firms based in Israel. On the other hand, the advanced capitalist nations will invest more heavily in Israel, will buy certain specialized Israeli products, and will seek a greater slice of the local market.

Since 1948, Israel's economic growth, which is treated as a structural model by some apologists for imperialism, has been based upon steadily rising inputs of foreign capital, both private and public. Grants and loans from the United States government alone since 1948 have totalled $2 billion. Although private investment has been outweighed by public loans or "philanthropic" subsidies, such as United Jewish Appeal donations, these inputs have contributed to the creation of an advanced industrial sector that can now yield superprofits to private foreign investors.

It is no accident that weapons are presently one of Israel's principal industries. In terms of Israel's role as one of the protectors of imperialism in the Middle East, it is logical that such firms as Motorola or General Telephone would seek to establish local branches in order to profit from the demands of the Israeli armed forces. At the same time, Israel's political and military role in certain Third World nations has laid the foundation for profitable military exports.

For more than a decade, Israeli "foreign assistance" programs, which are largely financed by American sources, have included such components as training of paratroopers for the Congo (Kinshasa) or counterinsurgency training for the police and armed forces of Ethiopia. (*Tricontinental,* November 1969) Similarly in the Far East, Israel has maintained a military training program in Singapore and has furnished the local army with tanks and electronic equipment. (*Der Spiegel,* November 3, 1969) Today it is clear that some governments are expected to show their gratitude by beating a path to the door of the Israeli arms indus-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

try, which in some cases can undersell American or European manufacturers.

Similarly, Israel's direct sales of certain weapons to the United States or to NATO customers represent another type of threat to the liberation struggles of the Third World. Integration of the Israeli weapons industry, in which American and European capital already plays a major role, into imperialism's "global defense systems" cannot be ignored by those who are committed to the overthrow of imperialism.

While Israeli officials and their sympathizers hypocritically condemn the use of "terrorism" by the Palestinian people in their fight for self-determination, it becomes increasingly important to expose the terrorism of those who seek to peddle such sophisticated instruments of death as the "Arava" anti-guerrilla plane, the "Gabriel" missile, or the "Uzi" submachine gun. A new phase has emerged in the unholy alliance among "Foreign Capital, Big Guns, and Greater Israel."

*Lawrence Lockwood**

Waltham, Mass.
September 1972

---

* Lawrence Lockwood is the author of a pamphlet, *Imperialism and the Israeli Economy*, available from Box 63, Norton Union, SUNYAB, Buffalo, N.Y. 14214.

SUBSCRIBERS: TO CHANGE YOUR ADDRESS

Please write us BEFORE you move, 60 days in advance if you can.

Mail to Subscription Dept., Monthly Review, 116 W. 14 St. New York City 10011

1. In this space, attach an OLD address label (or, if you don't have a label, give us your old address).

Name

OLD address

City State Zip

2. And in this space, please print carefully your NEW address.

Name

NEW address

City State Zip

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*Continued from inside front cover*)

and correspondence should be addressed to Hillel Tiktin, 31 Clevedon Road, Glasgow G12 OPH, Scotland.

We have been asked to make a number of announcements of interest to one or another group of MR readers:

(1) The Mid-Atlantic Regional Conference of Radical Historians will be held at Fordham University, Bronx, N.Y., on January 27-28. There will be no formal papers, but those planning to attend are encouraged to come prepared to talk about their own work in detail. Contact Mark Naison, 317 W. 99th St., Apt. 4B, NYC 10025 (telephone: 212-663-7795).

(2) The Union for Radical Political Economics (URPE) has formed a Movement Coordinating Committee, a chief function of which is to contact groups working for social change and to cooperate with them in writing short, clear pamphlets on political-economic topics such as taxes, health care, welfare, inflation, etc. Anyone who wants to help, individually or collectively, or who has ideas about what to write or whom to contact, should get in touch with Ruth Indeck, 521 W. 122nd St., Apt. 4, NYC 10027 (telephone: 212-850-6144).

(3) Another conference of interest to historians (and other social scientists) is being organized by the New Haven URPE Collective. The subject is "Marxian Approaches to History," and it will take place in New Haven the weekend of February 24-25. Papers will be presented, and those interested in doing so should send copies as soon as possible (in no case later than February 10) to New Haven URPE Collective, c/o Bob Sherry, 14 Sylvan Ave., New Haven, Conn. 06519. There will be a small charge to cover the conference's expenses; housing and day care will be provided.

(4) The Isaac Deutscher Memorial Prize (£100) for 1972 has been awarded to Paul Walton, Lecturer in Sociology at the University of Bradford, and Andrew Gamble, Tutor in Economics at Cambridge University, for their book *From Alienation to Surplus Value* (London: Sheed & Ward, 1972). The Prize for 1973 will be awarded in the fall of 1973 from among works (published or in typescript) submitted by May 1, 1973, to the Isaac Deutscher Memorial Prize, c/o Lloyds Bank, 68 Warwick Square, London SW 1.

An error in the quotation from Lorraine Hansberry used as "filler" on page 63 of the November issue has been called to our attention. "Tokenism" should read "extremism."

It is with sorrow that we record the death of our old friend Carl Haessler at the age of 84 in Detroit on December 1, after a long illness. Carl was head of the Federated Press, the labor-news wire service, for 36 years, and was active in union and radical causes for many more years. We were especially touched by a hand-written note on an obituary notice sent out to friends and acquaintances by his wife Lucy: "Carl was so devoted to MR." And we were devoted to him.

From time to time we receive a bequest from a reader who felt, in his lifetime, that financial support would help make possible the continuance of MR as a completely independent magazine. Any reader who may be moved to follow this example should be careful to state exactly, in his will, that the bequest is to: "Monthly Review, Inc., of 116 West 14th Street, New York, N. Y. 10011."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

You can build a socialist library at half-price

by joining

MONTHLY REVIEW ASSOCIATES

Membership entitles you to:

- *A discount of 50% off the list price* of any MR Press book. A $12 book for $6 or a $3.95 paperback book for half-price, represents a considerable saving—enough to enable you to buy twice as many books.
- A one-year subscription to MONTHLY REVIEW (if you are already a subscriber we renew your sub automatically).
- A copy of *White Niggers of America* by Pierre Vallières (list price, $7.95). ". . . will take its place alongside the writings of Malcolm X, Eldridge Cleaver, Frantz Fanon, Che Guevara, and Régis Debray."—*New York Times.*

Help MR Press become an effective press of the Left; help the magazine extend its influence, and help yourself to some important books by joining the Associates now.

Monthly Review Associates 116 W. 14th St. N.Y., N.Y. 10011

I enclose $..... Please enroll me as an MR Associate.

Check category below

☐	$ 25 - $49; £10.50 - £20.50	Supporting Associate
☐	$ 50 - $99; £21 - £41.50	Sustaining Associate
☐	$100 and over; £42 and over	Foundation Associate

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... State ..... Zip .....

Please make check payable to Monthly Review Associates

Those who wish to pay in sterling should remit to our London office.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED